arXiv:1011.6287v1 [math.OA] 29 Nov 2010

K-theory, Cyclic Cohomology and Pairings for Quantum Heisenberg Manifolds

Olivier Gabriel

November 30, 2010

Contents

1 Introduction 2
2 Quick Review of QHM 3
3 Cyclic Cocycles and Lie Groups Actions 5
4 Modules and even Pairings 7
  4.1 Connexions and Pairings for $\mathscr{N}$ 9
  4.2 Connexions and Pairings for $\mathscr{N}^\dagger$ 11
5 Unitaries and First Odd Pairings 13
6 Top Degree Pairing 16
    6.0.1 Terms T_{132} and T_{231} 18
    6.0.2 Terms T_{123} and T_{213} 18
    6.0.3 Termes T_{312} and T_{321} 19
    6.0.4 Synthesis and Final Computation 20
7 Consequences of the Pairings 21
8 Dimension of $HP^*(\mathscr{D})$ 23
9 Final Remarks 24
A From Pimsner Algebras to Toeplitz Algebras 26
References 28

Abstract

The C^*-algebras called Quantum Heisenberg Manifolds (QHM) were introduced by Rieffel in 1989 as strict deformation quantizations of Heisenberg manifolds. In this article, we compute the pairings of K-theory and cyclic cohomology on the QHM. Combining these calculations with other results proved elsewhere, we also determine the periodic cyclic homology and cohomology of these algebras, and obtain explicit bases of the periodic cyclic cohomology of the QHM. We further isolate bases of periodic cyclic homology, expressed as Chern characters of the K-theory.

Keywords: quantum Heisenberg manifolds; K-theory; cyclic cohomology; Chern-Connes pairings; generalized crossed product; Pimsner algebra; Heisenberg group.

1 Introduction

Quantum Heisenberg Manifolds (QHM) were introduced by Rieffel in [22]. They are a family of C^*-algebras $D^c_{\mu,\nu}$ indexed by $c \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\mu, \nu \in \mathbb{R}$. These algebras D have since been closely studied in series of articles by Abadie (see for instance [1, 2, 5, 3]) and Chakraborty (see [7] and [6]). In the article [4] by Abadie, Eilers and Exel, it was proved that QHM are *generalised crossed products*. This notion was later unified by Katsura [15, 16] with that of *Pimsner algebra* ([20]). In their article [11], Connes and Dubois-Violette related QHM to the noncommutative 3-spheres they introduced in [10].

The present article is a refinement of the previous studies of QHM, by means of pairings between cyclic cohomology and K-theory. These pairings were first defined by Connes in his article [8] of 1985. They have a parity: odd cocycles pair with K_1 and even cocycles with K_0.

After reviewing QHM and the associated Heisenberg group action, we define a smooth subalgebra $\mathscr{D}$ of D. Using the general proposition 3.5, we then construct *explicit* cyclic cocycles $(\varphi_i)_{i=1,2,3}$, $(\varphi_{i,3})_{i=1,2}$ and $\varphi_{1,2,3}$ out of the Lie group action (see proposition 3.8). We rely on previous work by Abadie to obtain projective finitely generated modules $\mathscr{N}$, $\mathscr{N}^\dagger$ over $\mathscr{D}$. We then construct a generating set (U_1, U_2, U_3) of $K_1(\mathscr{D}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{C}$.

There are two main results. The first one are the theorems 8.3 and 8.4:

Theorem. *Taking the notations of proposition 3.8 and section 5,*

- *the family* $(\tau, \varphi_{1,3}, \varphi_{2,3})$ *is a basis of* $HP^0(\mathscr{D})$*;*
- *the family* $(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_{1,2,3})$ *is a basis of* $HP^1(\mathscr{D})$*;*
- *the family* $(\mathrm{Ch}(U_1), \mathrm{Ch}(U_2), \mathrm{Ch}(U_3))$ *is a basis of* $HP_1(\mathscr{D})$*.*

Moreover, if $\mu \neq 0 \neq \nu$*, then the family* $\left(\mathrm{Ch}\left(\mathscr{D}^c_{\mu,\nu}\right), \mathrm{Ch}\left(\mathscr{N}^c_{\mu,\nu}\right), \mathrm{Ch}\left(\mathscr{N}^{\dagger\, c}_{\mu,\nu}\right)\right)$ *is a basis of* $HP_0(\mathscr{D}^c_{\mu,\nu})$*.*

Notice that this theorem relies on kk-equivalences that are constructed in [14]. The proof also depends on the two tables (4.1) and (5.3):

	τ	$\varphi_{1,3}$	$\varphi_{2,3}$
$[\mathscr{D}]$	1	0	0
$[\mathscr{N}]$	2μ	$-i2\pi$	0
$[\mathscr{N}^\dagger]$	-2ν	0	$-i2\pi$

	φ_1	φ_2	$\varphi_{1,2,3}$
$[U_1]$	$-\sqrt{i2\pi}$	0	0
$[U_2]$	0	$-\sqrt{i2\pi}$	0
$[U_3]$	$\sqrt{i2\pi}\, 2c\nu$	$-\sqrt{i2\pi}\, 2c\mu$	$(i2\pi)^{3/2}c/3$

that give the pairings of cyclic cohomology with K-theory in the even and odd cases. The computation of these tables is the second main result.

This paper is organised as follows. In section 2, we review the properties of the QHM. Section 3 is devoted to the construction of cyclic cocycles. The pairings in the even cases are computed in section 4. Sections 5 and 6 are concerned with the calculation in the odd cases. Section 7 focuses on the unfolding the consequences of the previous computations. The computation of the periodic homology and cohomology is completed in section 8. We conclude in section 9 by some remarks, and finally include a construction of the Toeplitz algebra of the Pimsner algebra.

2 Quick Review of QHM

We will define the QHM as *generalised crossed product* of $A = C(T^2)$ by a certain Hilbert bimodule $M^c_{\mu,\nu}$. A general reference for Hilbert modules is [17]. As several definitions of "Hilbert bimodules" exist in the literature, we specify our notion:

Definition 2.1 (Hilbert bimodule)**.** A *A-A-Hilbert bimodule* ${}_AE_A$ is a vector space E such that:

- E_A is a right Hilbert module with A-valued scalar product $\langle\, , \,\rangle_A$;
- ${}_AE$ is a left Hilbert module with scalar product ${}_A\langle\, , \,\rangle$;
- the scalar products are compatible in the sense that $\xi\langle\zeta,\eta\rangle_A = {}_A\langle\xi,\zeta\rangle\eta$.

We follow the definitions 2.1 and 2.4 of [4]:

Definition 2.2 (covariant representation)**.** Let ${}_AE_A$ be a A-A Hilbert bimodule. A *covariant representation* of E on a C^*-algebra B is a pair (π,τ) made up of:

- a $*$-homomorphism of algebras $\pi : A \to B$;
- a linear map $\mathcal{T} : E \to B$ satisfying

$$\begin{array}{llll} (i) & \mathcal{T}(\xi)^*\mathcal{T}(\zeta) = \pi(\langle\xi|\zeta\rangle_A) & (ii) & \mathcal{T}(\xi)\pi(a) = \mathcal{T}(\xi a) \\ (iii) & \pi(a)\mathcal{T}(\xi) = \mathcal{T}(a\xi) & (iv) & \mathcal{T}(\xi)\mathcal{T}(\zeta)^* = \pi({}_A\langle\xi|\zeta\rangle). \end{array}$$

The associated C^*-algebra is:

Definition 2.3 (generalised crossed product)**.** Let ${}_AE_A$ be a A-A Hilbert bimodule. The *generalised crossed product* $A \rtimes_E \mathbb{Z}$ of A by E is the universal C^*-algebra generated by the covariant representations of ${}_AE_A$.

We now define the Hilbert bimodule $M^c_{\mu,\nu}$ that we will use.

Definition 2.4 (Hilbert bimodule over A)**.** Given two real numbers μ,ν and an integer $c > 0$, we define a Hilbert bimodule $M^c_{\mu,\nu}$ over $A = C(T^2)$ as the set of continuous functions $\xi : \mathbb{R} \times S^1 \to \mathbb{C}$ which satisfy:

$$\xi(x+1,y) = e(-c(y-\nu))\xi(x,y) \qquad\qquad \xi(x,y+1) = \xi(x,y). \tag{2.1}$$

where $e(x) = e^{2\pi i x}$. We give it a bimodule structure by (direct) pointwise multiplication on the left and right multiplication defined by $(\xi \cdot a)(x,y) = \xi(x,y)\sigma(a)(x,y)$ where σ is the automorphism of A defined by $\sigma(a)(x,y) = a(x-2\mu, y-2\nu)$. Finally, the scalar products are:

$$\langle\xi_1,\xi_2\rangle_A(x,y) = \overline{\xi_1(x+2\mu,y+2\nu)}\xi_2(x+2\mu,y+2\nu) \tag{2.2}$$

$${}_A\langle\xi_1,\xi_2\rangle(x,y) = \xi_1(x,y)\overline{\xi_2(x,y)}, \tag{2.3}$$

For conveniance, we will use the shorthand notation M instead of $M^c_{\mu,\nu}$.We can easily verify that this indeed defines a Hilbert bimodule. We are now ready to define the QHM:

Definition 2.5 (quantum Heisenberg manifolds)**.** Given an integer $c > 0$ and $\mu, \nu \in \mathbb{R}$, the *quantum Heisenberg manifold* $D^c_{\mu,\nu}$ is the generalised crossed product $A \rtimes_{M^c_{\mu,\nu}} \mathbb{Z}$ of A by $M^c_{\mu,\nu}$.

In the following, we will write D instead of $D^c_{\mu,\nu}$ whenever possible. We will identify the elements $\xi \in M$ with their images in D. From the definition of D, it appears that for any $\xi, \zeta \in M$

$$_A\langle \xi, \zeta \rangle = \xi\zeta^* \qquad\qquad \langle \xi, \zeta \rangle_A = \xi^*\zeta.$$

To give a more concrete definition (see [4]), D is a completion of the algebra:

$$D_0 = \{F \in C_c(\mathbb{Z} \to C_b(\mathbb{R} \times S^1)) | F(p, x + 1, y) = e(-cp(y - p\nu))F(p, x, y)\}$$

equipped with multiplication:

$$(F_1 \cdot F_2)(p, x, y) = \sum_{q\in\mathbb{Z}} F_1(q, x, y)F_2(p - q, x - q2\mu, y - q2\nu) \tag{2.4}$$

and involution:

$$F^*(p, x, y) = \overline{F}(-p, x - 2p\mu, y - 2p\nu).$$

As every generalised crossed product, D is endowed with a gradation by $\mathbb{Z}$: $a \in A \subseteq D$ has degree 0 and $\xi \in M \subseteq D$ has degree 1.

Proposition 2.6. *For all* $M^c_{\mu,\nu}$*, we can find* $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in M^c_{\mu,\nu}$ *such that:*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{2} \xi_i^*\xi_i = \sum_{i=1}^{2} \langle \xi_i, \xi_i \rangle_A = 1 \qquad\qquad \sum_{i=1}^{2} \xi_i\xi_i^* = \sum_{i=1}^{2} {}_A\langle \xi_i, \xi_i \rangle = 1. \tag{2.5}$$

Proof. Let U_1, U_2 be the respective images of $V_1 =]-1/3, 1/3[$ and $V_2 =]1/6, 5/6[$ by the quotient map $\pi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \simeq S^1$. U_1, U_2 is an open cover of S^1. We call $\widetilde{\chi_1}, \widetilde{\chi_2}$ a subordinated smooth partition of the unity of S^1. Setting $\chi_i = \frac{\widetilde{\chi_i}}{\sqrt{\widetilde{\chi_1}^2 + \widetilde{\chi_2}^2}}$, we get χ_1 and χ_2 such that $\chi_1^2 + \chi_2^2 = 1$ and $\operatorname{Supp} \chi_i \subseteq U_i$.

To define ξ_1 on the cylinder $\mathbb{R} \times S^1$, we first set $\xi_1(x, y) = \chi_1(x)$ on $[-1/2, 1/2] \times S^1$. This function can then be extended to the whole $\mathbb{R} \times S^1$ by enforcing the equations (2.1). Notice that the extension is possible because ξ_1 vanishes on the boundaries of $[-1/2, 1/2] \times S^1$.

The same process can be applied on $[0, 1] \times S^1$ to define ξ_2. In the end, we get ξ_i such that

$$\langle \xi_i, \xi_i \rangle_A(x, y) = \chi_i(x + 2\mu, y + 2\nu)\overline{\chi_i(x + 2\mu, y + 2\nu)} = \chi_i^2(x + 2\mu, y + 2\nu).$$

The first equation of (2.5) hence comes from the property of the χ_i. The same kind of computation provides the second equation. ☐

Definition 2.7 (Heisenberg group H_1)**.** The Heisenberg group H_1 is the subgroup of $GL_3(\mathbb{R})$ of the matrices

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & s & t \\ 0 & 1 & r \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, r, s, t \in \mathbb{R} \tag{2.6}$$

The following definition has its origin in [22], proposition 5.6.

Definition 2.8 (action of the Heisenberg group)**.** There is a pointwise continuous action of H_1 on D defined on D_0 by:

$$\alpha_{(r,s,t)}(F)(p,x,y) = e\big(p(t + cs(x - r))\big)F(p, x - r, y - s).$$

Using the parameters (r, s, t), the infinitesimal generators of this action are:

$$\partial_1 F(p,x,y) = -\frac{\partial F}{\partial x}(p,x,y) \qquad \partial_3(F)(p,x,y) = i2\pi pF(p,x,y)$$

$$\partial_2(F)(p,x,y) = -\frac{\partial F}{\partial y}(p,x,y) + i2\pi pcxF(p,x,y).$$

and they fulfill the commutation relations:

$$[\partial_1, \partial_2] = -c\partial_3 \qquad [\partial_1, \partial_3] = 0 \qquad [\partial_2, \partial_3] = 0. \tag{2.7}$$

Definition 2.9 (trace on QHM)**.** A trace τ is given by $\tau(F) = \int_0^1 \int_{S^1} F(x,y,0)dydx$. It is invariant under the action of H_1.

Finally, the K-theory of the QHM was computed in [2] (theorem 3.4):

Theorem 2.10 (Abadie, 1995)**.**

$$K_0(D) = \mathbb{Z}^3 \oplus \mathbb{Z}/c\mathbb{Z} \qquad K_1(D) = \mathbb{Z}^3.$$

3 Cyclic Cocycles and Lie Groups Actions

The definition of cyclic cohomology was given in [9] III.1 p.182:

Definition 3.1 (Cyclic Cohomology)**.** Given an algebra $\mathscr{A}$, the *cyclic cohomology* $HC^n(\mathscr{A})$ is the cohomology of the complex (C^n_λ, b) where C^n_λ is the space $(n+1)$-linear forms ϕ on $\mathscr{A}$ such that:

$$\phi(a^0, a^1, \cdots, a^n) = (-1)^n \phi(a^n, a^0, \cdots, a^n)$$

and the coboundary map b is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} b\phi(a^0, \dots, a^n, a^{n+1}) = & \sum_{j=0}^{n} (-1)^j \phi(a^0, \dots, a^j a^{j+1}, \dots, a^{n+1}) \\ & + (-1)^{n+1}\phi(a^{n+1}a^0, \dots, a^n). \end{aligned}$$

A *cyclic cocycle* is a closed cochain in the above sense.

Definition 3.2 (Cycle)**.** A *cycle of dimension* n is a triple $(\Omega, d, \int)$ where $\Omega = \bigoplus_{j=0}^{n} \Omega^j$ is a graded algebra over $\mathbb{C}$, d is a graded derivation of degree 1 such that $d^2 = 0$ and $\int : \Omega^n \to \mathbb{C}$ is a closed graded trace on Ω.

A *cycle over an algebra* $\mathscr{A}$ is a cycle $(\Omega, d, \int)$ together with an homomorphism $\rho : \mathscr{A} \to \Omega^0$.

We can restate the proposition 4, III.1 [9]:

Proposition 3.3. *All cyclic cocycle arise as trace of a cycle and vice versa.*

In the following definition and proposition, we adapt the construction of [9], III.6, example 12 c) p.254:

Definition 3.4 (Differential Algebra Associated to a Lie Group Action)**.** Let A be a Banach algebra equipped with a pointwise continuous action α of the Lie group G. We let $\mathscr{A} = \{x \in A : g \mapsto \alpha_g(x) \in C^\infty(G \to A)\}$, and $\mathscr{G}$ be the Lie algebra associated to G.

The *differential algebra* Ω_G *associated with the action* α is the graded differential algebra defined by the alternating $\mathscr{A}$-valued multilinear forms on $\mathscr{G}$ equipped with the differential d:

$$\begin{aligned} d\omega(X_1, \dots, X_{n+1}) = &\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} (-1)^i X_i \omega(X_1, \dots, \check{X}_i, \dots, X_{n+1}) \\ &+ \sum_{i<j} (-1)^{i+j} \omega([X_i, X_j], X_1, \dots, \check{X}_i, \dots, \check{X}_j, \dots X_{n+1}). \end{aligned}$$

The following proposition is a restatement of the property described in [9], p.255. We adapt it to our simple case and state it:

Proposition 3.5. *If* τ *is a* G*-invariant trace over* A *and* $\xi_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \xi_k \in \Lambda^k \mathscr{G}$ *satisfies*

$$\sum_{i<j} (-1)^{i+j} [\xi_i, \xi_j] \wedge \xi_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \hat{\xi}_i \wedge \cdots \wedge \hat{\xi}_j \wedge \cdots \wedge \xi_n = 0, \tag{3.1}$$

then

$$(a_0 \otimes a_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes a_n) \mapsto \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_n} \epsilon(\sigma) \tau\big(a_0 \xi_{\sigma(1)}(a_1) \cdots \xi_{\sigma(n)}(a_n)\big)$$

is a cyclic cocycle on $\mathscr{A}$*.*

Definition 3.6 (smooth QHM)**.** We define the *smooth QHM* $\mathscr{D}$ by $\mathscr{D} = \{F \in D : g \mapsto \alpha_g(F) \in C^\infty(H_1 \to D)\}$.

As α is pointwise continuous, the following property is well known (see [23], p.138):

Lemma 3.7. $\mathscr{D}$ *is a dense subalgebra that is stable under holomorphic functional calculus. In particular*

$$K_0(\mathscr{D}) = K_0(D) = \mathbb{Z}^3 \oplus \mathbb{Z}/c\mathbb{Z} \qquad\qquad K_1(\mathscr{D}) = K_1(D) = \mathbb{Z}^3. \tag{3.2}$$

Proposition 3.8. *The 7 following multilinear forms are cyclic cocycles on* $\mathscr{D}$*:*

- *Degree 0: trace* τ*.*

- *Degree 1:* φ_i *for* $i = 1, 2, 3$ *where* $\varphi_i(a_0, a_1) = \tau(a_0 \partial_i(a_1))$.
- *Degree 2:* $\varphi_{1,3}$ *and* $\varphi_{2,3}$ *where*

$$\varphi_{i,3}(a_0, a_1, a_2) = \tau\Big(a_0\big(\partial_i(a_1)\partial_3(a_2) - \partial_3(a_1)\partial_i(a_2)\big)\Big).$$

- *Degree 3:* $\varphi_{1,2,3}$ *given by:*

$$\varphi_{1,2,3}(a_0, a_1, a_2, a_3) = \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_3} \varepsilon(\sigma)\tau\Big(a_0 \partial_{\sigma(1)} a_1 \partial_{\sigma(2)} a_2 \partial_{\sigma(3)} a_3\Big).$$

Proof. This is a straightforward application of proposition 3.5.

- Degree 0: there is nothing to check since τ is a trace.
- Degree 1: any derivation generates a cyclic cocycle.
- Degree 2: the commutation relations (2.7) show that $\xi_1 \wedge \xi_3$ and $\xi_2 \wedge \xi_3$ satisfy the condition (3.1).
- Degree 3: start with $\xi_1 \wedge \xi_2 \wedge \xi_3$. The condition can therefore be written:

$$(-1)^3[\xi_1, \xi_2] \wedge \xi_3 + (-1)^4[\xi_1, \xi_3] \wedge \xi_2 + (-1)^5[\xi_2, \xi_3] \wedge \xi_1 = 0.$$

  The commutation relations (2.7) ensure that this expression vanishes.

□

Remark 3.9. One could expect a third 2-cyclic cocycle $\varphi_{1,2}$ given by $\varphi_{1,2}(a_0, a_1, a_2) = \tau\Big(a_0\big(\partial_1(a_1)\partial_2(a_2) - \partial_2(a_1)\partial_1(a_2)\big)\Big)$. $\varphi_{1,2}$ is indeed a *Hochschild* cocycle, as an easy computation shows. However, proposition 9.1 implies that $\varphi_{1,2}$ is *not* a *cyclic* cocycle.

Proof. Indeed, if $\varphi_{1,2}$ were a cyclic cocycle, then $\varphi_{1,2}(1, a_1, a_2) = 0$. Yet,

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi_{1,2}(1, a_1, a_2) &= \tau(\partial_1(a_1)\partial_2(a_2) - \partial_2(a_1)\partial_1(a_2)) = \\
&= \tau(\partial_1(a_1\partial_2(a_2)) - \partial_2(a_1\partial_2(a_2))) - \tau(a_1\partial_1\partial_2(a_2) - a_1\partial_2\partial_1(a_2)) = \\
&= c\tau(a_1\partial_3(a_2)) = c\varphi_3(a_1, a_2),
\end{aligned}$$

using (2.7). But the proposition 9.1 proves that φ_3 pairs nontrivially with a Hochschild cocycle and therefore is nonzero. □

4 Modules and even Pairings

Bear in mind (see [8] part II, theorem 9) that if $a_i \otimes b_i \in A \otimes M_n(\mathbb{C})$ and $\phi \in HC^*$, the cup product $\phi \# \operatorname{Tr}$ is defined by:

$$(\phi \# \operatorname{Tr})(a^0 \otimes b^0, \dots, a^n \otimes b^n) = \phi(a^0, \dots, a^n) \operatorname{Tr}(b^0 \cdots b^n).$$

We follow the definition and normalisations of [9] (III.3 proposition 2):

Definition 4.1 (even Chern-Connes Pairings)**.** The following formula defines a bilinear pairing between $K_0(\mathscr{A})$ and $HC^{2m}(\mathscr{A})$:

$$\langle [e], [\phi] \rangle = \frac{1}{m!}(\phi \# \operatorname{Tr})(e, \ldots, e)$$

where $[e] \in K_0$ and $\phi \in ZC^{2m}$.

Furthermore, there is a *periodicity map* $S : HC^n \to HC^{n+2}$ which enables us to define the groups $HP^*(\mathscr{A})$ – see [23], 10.1, definition 10.5 p.445:

Definition 4.2 (periodic cyclic cohomology)**.** The *periodic cyclic cohomology* are the two groups obtained as inductive limits:

$$HP^0(\mathscr{A}) = \lim_{\to} HC^{2k}(\mathscr{A}) \qquad\qquad HP^1(\mathscr{A}) = \lim_{\to} HC^{2k+1}(\mathscr{A}).$$

The above pairings are in fact defined on $HP^0(\mathscr{A})$ because they satisfy $\langle [e], [S\phi] \rangle = \langle [e], [\phi] \rangle$.

Theorem 4.3. *If $\mu \neq 0 \neq \nu$, we can define projective finitely generated modules N and $N^\dagger$ over D, and the values of the pairings are given by the table:*

	τ	$\varphi_{1,3}$	$\varphi_{2,3}$
$[\mathscr{D}]$	1	0	0
$[\mathscr{N}]$	2μ	$-i2\pi$	0
$[\mathscr{N}^\dagger]$	-2ν	0	$-i2\pi$

(4.1)

Notice that:

- the first column of this table was computed by B. Abadie in [3];
- if $\mu = 0$ or $\nu = 0$, then the projective finitely generated modules $\mathscr{N}$ and $\mathscr{N}^\dagger$ are not both defined. In this case, we have to use the isomorphism between $D^c_{\mu+1,\nu+1}$ and $D^c_{\mu,\nu}$ that was proved by Abadie in [1]. This phenomenon of "disappearing module" may be surprising, but it also happens with "Schwartz modules" in the case of noncommutative tori – see [8] part II, definition above lemma 54.

The projective finitely generated modules over $D^c_{\mu,\nu}$ were studied by Abadie in [1] and [2]. We present the results of [1] pp. 2–3:

Theorem 4.4 (Abadie, 1992)**.** *For all $c \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $\mu, \nu \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\mu^2 + \nu^2 \neq 0$, there is a projective and finitely generated right module $N^c_{\mu,\nu}$ over $D^c_{\mu,\nu}$. $N^c_{\mu,\nu}$ is obtained by completing $C_c(\mathbb{R} \times S^1)$ with respect to the $D^c_{\mu,\nu}$-valued scalar product:*

$$\langle f, g \rangle_{D^c_{\mu,\nu}}(p, x, y) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} e(cnp(y - p\nu))\overline{f(x+n, y)}g(x - 2p\mu + n, y - 2p\nu).$$

The right action of $D^c_{\mu,\nu}$ is given by

$$(f \cdot F)(x, y) = \sum_q f(x - 2q\mu, y - 2q\nu)F(-q, x - 2q\mu, y - 2q\nu)$$

Moreover $\operatorname{Tr}\left(\operatorname{Id}_{N^c_{\mu,\nu}}\right) = 2\mu$.

We will write N instead of $N^c_{\mu,\nu}$ whenever possible.

Remark 4.5. This module N is in fact the dual to the module X given in [1], p.2.

4.1 Connexions and Pairings for $\mathscr{N}$

The definition of a (noncommutative) connexion is given in [9], III.3. definition 5:

Definition 4.6 (Connexion)**.** Let $\mathscr{A} \xrightarrow{\rho} \Omega$ be a cycle over $\mathscr{A}$, and $\mathscr{E}$ a finite projective module over $\mathscr{A}$, a *connexion* ∇ on $\mathscr{E}$ is a linear map $\nabla : \mathscr{E} \to \mathscr{E} \otimes_{\mathscr{A}} \Omega^1$ such that:

$$\forall \xi \in \mathscr{E}, \forall a \in \mathscr{A}, \qquad \nabla(\xi a) = (\nabla \xi)a + \xi \otimes d\rho(a)$$

Notice that in the above definition, we do not actually need the trace $\int$ of the cycle. We could equally consider a "graded differential algebra over $\mathscr{A}$".

The following proposition enables us to compute the even pairings using the connexions – see [9], III.3 proposition 8:

Proposition 4.7. *Let $\mathscr{E}_{\mathscr{A}}$ be a finitely generated projective module over $\mathscr{A}$. Assume that we have a cycle $(\Omega, d, \int)$ over $\mathscr{A}$.*

1. *$\widetilde{\mathscr{E}} = \mathscr{E} \otimes_{\mathscr{A}} \Omega$ is a finitely generated projective Ω-module.*
2. *All connexion ∇ can be uniquely extended to a linear application from $\widetilde{\mathscr{E}}$ into itself that satisfies :*

$$\forall \xi \in \mathscr{E}, \omega \in \Omega, \qquad \nabla(\xi \otimes \omega) = (\nabla \xi)\omega + \xi \otimes d\omega$$

3. *One has*

$$\langle [\mathscr{E}], [\tau] \rangle = \frac{1}{m!} \int \theta^m$$

where

- *n is the (even) dimension of the cycle Ω and $n = 2m$;*
- *$[\mathscr{E}] \in K_0(\mathscr{A})$ is the class of $\mathscr{E}$;*
- *τ is the character of Ω;*
- *$\int$ is the trace of the cycle;*
- *θ is the endormorphism of $\widetilde{\mathscr{E}}$ defined by $\theta = \nabla^2$.*

Definition 4.8 (Covariant Action)**.** Let E_A be a module over a C^*-algebra A. A *covariant action* of a Lie group G on E_A is a pair (α, β) where α and β are actions of G on A and E respectively, which satisfy

$$\forall \xi \in E, \forall a \in A \qquad \beta_g(\xi a) = \beta_g(\xi)\alpha_g(a).$$

Proposition 4.9. *If (α, β) is a covariant action on E_A, then*

- *we can define a $\mathscr{A}$-module $\mathscr{E}_{\mathscr{A}}$ as the set of "G-regular elements";*
- *the module $\mathscr{E}$ is equipped with a connexion $\nabla : \mathscr{E} \to \mathscr{E} \otimes \mathscr{G}^*$ over the differential algebra Ω_G.*

Proof. We define $\mathscr{E}$ in the following way:

$$\mathscr{E} = \{\xi \in E : g \mapsto \beta_g(\xi) \text{ is in } C^\infty(G \to E)\}.$$

This is a module over $\mathscr{A}$: if $\xi \in \mathscr{E}$, then $\xi a \in \mathscr{E}$ because $g \mapsto \beta_g(\xi a) = \beta_g(\xi)\alpha_g(a)$.

Define ∇ by

$$\nabla_X \xi = \lim_{t\to 0} \frac{\beta_{e^{tX}}(\xi) - \xi}{t}.$$

This is clearly a map $\mathscr{E} \to \mathscr{E} \otimes \mathscr{G}^*$.

Let us check that ∇ is a connexion:

$$\nabla_X(\xi a) = \lim_{t\to 0} \frac{\beta_{e^{tX}}(\xi a) - \xi a}{t} = \lim_{t\to 0} \frac{\beta_{e^{tX}}(\xi)\alpha_{e^{tX}}(a) - \xi a}{t} =$$
$$= \lim_{t\to 0} \frac{1}{t}\left(\beta_{e^{tX}}(\xi)\alpha_{e^{tX}}(a) - \xi\alpha_{e^{tX}}(a) + \xi\alpha_{e^{tX}}(a) - \xi a\right) = (\nabla_X\xi)a + \xi\partial_X(a).$$

□

Proposition 4.10. *If $\mu \neq 0$, there is a covariant action β of H_1 on N_D given by*

$$\beta_{(r,s,t)}(f)(x,y) = e^{ix\frac{\pi}{\mu}(t+scx/2)} f(x-r, y-s)$$

Proof. On the one hand,

$$\beta_{(r,s,t)}(f\cdot F)(x,y) =$$
$$= e^{ix\frac{\pi}{\mu}(t+scx/2)} \sum_q f(x-r-2q\mu, y-s-2q\nu) F(-q, x-r-2q\mu, y-s-2q\nu).$$

On the other hand,

$$\left(\beta_{(r,s,t)}(f)\cdot\alpha_{(r,s,t)}(F)\right)(x,y) =$$
$$= \sum_q e^{i(x-2q\mu)\frac{\pi}{\mu}\left(t+sc(x-2q\mu)/2\right)} f(x-r-2q\mu, y-s-2q\nu)$$
$$\times\, e\Big(q\big(t+cs(x-2q\mu-r+q\mu)\big)\Big) F(-q, x-r-2q\mu, y-s-2q\nu).$$

We can restrict this to study the phase factor

$$e^{i(x-2q\mu)\frac{\pi}{\mu}\left(t+sc(x-2q\mu)/2\right)}\, e^{i2\pi q\left(t+cs(x-q\mu)\right)}$$

while ignoring the $e^{i\cdot}$:

$$(x-2q\mu)\frac{\pi}{\mu}\big(t+sc(x-2q\mu)/2\big) + 2\pi q\big(t+cs(x-q\mu)\big) =$$
$$t\left(x\frac{\pi}{\mu} - 2\pi q + 2\pi q\right) + s\left((x-2q\mu)\frac{\pi}{\mu}c(x-2q\mu)/2 + 2\pi qc(x-q\mu)\right)$$
$$= x\frac{\pi}{\mu}t + sc\frac{\pi}{\mu}\left((x-2q\mu)^2/2 + 2q\mu(x-q\mu)\right) = x\frac{\pi}{\mu}(t+scx/2)$$

Integrating this property into the expression of $\beta_{(r,s,t)}(f)\cdot\alpha_{(r,s,t)}(F)$:

$$\left(\beta_{(r,s,t)}(f)\cdot\alpha_{(r,s,t)}(F)\right)(x,y) =$$
$$= \sum_q e^{ix\frac{\pi}{\mu}(t+scx/2)} f(x-r-2q\mu, y-s-2q\nu) F(-q, x-r-2q\mu, y-s-2q\nu)$$
$$= \beta_{(r,s,t)}(f\cdot F)(x,y).$$

□

Notation 4.11. We denote by $\mathscr{N}$ the $\mathscr{D}$-module of the elements of N that are regular under the action β of H_1. It is a finitely generated projective module over $\mathscr{D}$.

Using the covariant action on N, it is easy to construct connexions over $\mathscr{N}$:

Proposition 4.12. *The connexions over $\mathscr{N}$ associated to $\varphi_{1,3}$ and $\varphi_{2,3}$ respectively, are:*

$$(\nabla f)(x,y) = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(x,y)dx - \frac{i\pi}{\mu} x f(x,y) dp$$

and

$$(\nabla f)(x,y) = \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial y} - i\frac{\pi c}{2\mu}x^2 f\right) dy - \frac{i\pi}{\mu} x f(x,y) dp.$$

Proof. This is an obvious application of propositions 4.9 and 4.10. ☐

Proposition 4.13. *If $\mu \neq 0$, the pairings over $\mathscr{N}$ are given by* (4.1).

Proof. First consider the case of $\varphi_{1,3}$. Computing $\nabla^2 f$ yields:

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla(\nabla f) =& \nabla\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}dx - \frac{i\pi}{\mu}xf dp\right)\\ =& \left(\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x^2}dx - \frac{i\pi}{\mu}x\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}dp\right)dx - \frac{i\pi}{\mu}\left(\left(f + x\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}\right)dx - \frac{i\pi}{\mu}xf dp\right)dp\\ =& -i\frac{\pi}{\mu} f \otimes dx \wedge dp\end{aligned}$$

thus $\nabla^2 = -i\frac{\pi}{\mu}\,\mathrm{Id}_{\mathscr{N}} \otimes dx \wedge dp$. The trace of Id_N was computed by Abadie (theorem 4.4). The pairing is given by the table (4.1): $\tau(p) = 2\mu$. Hence

$$\langle [\mathscr{N}], \varphi_{1,3}\rangle = -i2\pi.$$

In the case of $\varphi_{2,3}$, the two terms in the connexion commute, so $\nabla^2 = 0$ and

$$\langle [\mathscr{N}], \varphi_{2,3}\rangle = 0.$$

☐

4.2 Connexions and Pairings for $\mathscr{N}^\dagger$

We define a second module $N^\dagger$ over D through an isomorphism between two D:

Proposition 4.14. *There is an isomorphism $\Phi : D^c_{\mu,\nu} \to D^c_{\nu,\mu}$, induced by the Hilbert bimodule representation:*

$$\pi(a)(x,y) = a(-y,-x) \qquad \mathcal{T}(\xi)(x,y) = e^{i2\pi c(y+\mu)(x+\nu)}\xi(-y,-x)$$

Moreover, this isomorphism intertwines the actions of H_1:

$$\Phi(\alpha_{r,s,t}(F)) = \alpha'_{-s,-r,-t+csr}(\Phi(F)) \tag{4.2}$$

where α and α' are the actions of H_1 over $D^c_{\mu,\nu}$ and $D^c_{\nu,\mu}$, respectively.

The intertwining of the actions proves that $\mathscr{D}^c_{\mu,\nu}$ and $\mathscr{D}^c_{\nu,\mu}$ are sent onto one another.

Proof. The existence of such isomorphism was proved in [5] theorem 2.2. However, we here give an *explicit* isomorphism and specify the intertwining relation.

Following the definition 2.5, the algebra $D^c_{\nu,\mu,0}$ of continous functions $\mathbb{Z}\times\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{C}$ which satisfy

$$F(p,x+1,y) = e(-cp(y-p\mu))F(p,x,y) \qquad F(p,x,y+1) = F(p,x,y).$$

is dense in $D^c_{\nu,\mu}$. The definition 2.5 implies that it suffices to check that there is a representation of the Hilbert bimodule $M^c_{\mu,\nu}$ in $D^c_{\nu,\mu}$ to get the morphism of algebra Φ.

Let us check that $\mathcal{T}(\xi)$ has the degree -1 in $D^c_{\nu,\mu,0}$:

$$\mathcal{T}(\xi)(x+1,y) = e^{i2\pi c(y+\mu)(x+1+\nu)}\xi(-y,-x-1) = e^{i2\pi c(y+\mu)}\mathcal{T}(\xi)(x,y)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{T}(\xi)(x,y+1) &= e^{i2\pi c(y+1+\mu)(x+\nu)}\xi(-y-1,-x) = \\ &= e^{i2\pi c(x+\nu)}e^{i2\pi c(y+\mu)(x+\nu)}e^{i2\pi c(-x-\nu)}\xi(-y,-x) = \mathcal{T}(\xi)(x,y).\end{aligned}$$

To prove that π and $\mathcal{T}$ induce a bimodule representation, it suffices to prove the points (i) and (iv) of definition 2.2. The others are consequences of these two (see [16] definition 2.1).

Regarding point (i):

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{T}(\xi)^*\mathcal{T}(\zeta)(x,y,0) = \\ &\quad= e^{-i2\pi c(y+\mu)(x+\nu)}\overline{\xi(-y+2\mu,-x+2\nu)}e^{i2\pi c(y+\mu)(x+\nu)}\zeta(-y+2\mu,-x+2\nu) = \\ &\quad= \overline{\xi(-y+2\mu,-x+2\nu)}\zeta(-y+2\mu,-x+2\nu) = \pi(\langle\xi,\zeta\rangle_A)(x,y).\end{aligned}$$

As for point (iv):

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{T}(\zeta)\mathcal{T}(\xi)^*(x,y,0) &= e^{i2\pi c(y+\mu)(x+\nu)}\zeta(-y,-x)e^{-i2\pi c(y+\mu)(x+\nu)}\overline{\xi(-y,-x)} = \\ &= \zeta(-y,-x)\overline{\xi(-y,-x)} = \pi\left({}_A\langle\zeta,\xi\rangle\right)(x,y).\end{aligned}$$

Hence, there is a homomorphism from $D^c_{\mu,\nu}$ into $D^c_{\nu,\mu}$.

$\pi(A)$ and $\mathcal{T}(E)$ generate the algebra, hence it suffices to check the intertwining (4.2) on these two sets. Denoting by α' the action of H_1 on $D^c_{\nu,\mu}$, we get:

$$\pi(\alpha_{r,s,t}(a))(x,y) = \pi(a(x-r,y-s)) = a(-y-r,-x-s) = \alpha'_{-s,-r,-t+csr}(\pi(a))(x,y)$$

as well as:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{T}(\alpha_{r,s,t}\xi)(x,y) &= \mathcal{T}\left(e\Big(-\big(t+cs(x-r-\mu)\big)\Big)\xi(x-r,y-s)\right) \\ &= e^{i2\pi c(y+\mu)(x+\nu)}e\Big(-\big(t+cs(-y-r-\mu)\big)\Big)\xi(-y-r,-x-s) \\ &= e\big(-t+c(y+\mu)(x+s+\nu)+csr\big)\xi(-y-r,-x-s) \\ &= e\big(-(t-csr)-cr(x+s+\nu)\big)e\big(c(y+r+\mu)(x+s+\nu)\big)\xi(-y-r,-x-s) \\ &= \big(\alpha'_{-s,-r,-t+csr}\mathcal{T}(\xi)\big)(x,y).\end{aligned}$$

□

Definition 4.15 (module $N^{\dagger\,c}_{\mu,\nu}$)**.** We define the module $N^{\dagger\,c}_{\mu,\nu}$ over $D^c_{\mu,\nu}$ as the module induced from $N^c_{\nu,\mu}$ through Φ. This module exists as soon as $\nu \neq 0$. Explicitely, the action of $D^c_{\mu,\nu}$ is given by $f \cdot F = f\,\Phi(F)$.

Remark 4.16. If P' is a projector of $M_n(D^c_{\nu,\mu})$ associated to $N^c_{\nu,\mu}$, then $P = \Phi^{-1}(P')$ is a projector of $M_n(D^c_{\mu,\nu})$ associated to $N^{\dagger\,c}_{\mu,\nu}$.

Lemma 4.17. *The cyclic cocycles $\varphi_{i,3}$ induced on $\mathscr{D}^c_{\mu,\nu}$ from the cyclic cocycles $\varphi'_{i,3}$ over $\mathscr{D}^c_{\nu,\mu}$ are given by:*

$$\Phi^*\varphi'_{1,3} = \varphi_{2,3} \qquad\qquad \Phi^*\varphi'_{2,3} = \varphi_{1,3}$$

Proof. We simply have to derive the intertwining relation to obtain:

$$-\Phi \circ \partial_1 = \partial'_2 \circ \Phi \qquad -\Phi \circ \partial_2 = \partial'_1 \circ \Phi \qquad -\Phi \circ \partial_3 = \partial'_3 \circ \Phi$$

linking the derivations ∂'_i of $\mathscr{D}^c_{\nu,\mu}$ and ∂_i of $\mathscr{D}^c_{\mu,\nu}$. The traces $\tau^c_{\mu,\nu}$ and $\tau^c_{\nu,\mu}$ are invariant in the sense that $\tau^c_{\nu,\mu}(\Phi(F)) = \tau^c_{\mu,\nu}(F)$. Consequently, the induced cocycles are:

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi^*\varphi'_{i,3}(a_0,a_1,a_2) &= \tau\Big(\Phi(a_0)\big[\partial'_i(\Phi(a_1))\partial'_3(\Phi(a_2)) - \partial'_3(\Phi(a_1))\partial'_i(\Phi(a_2))\big]\Big) = \\ &= \tau\Big(\Phi\big[a_0(\partial_j(a_1)\partial_3(a_2) - \partial_3(a_1)\partial_j(a_2))\big]\Big) = \varphi_{j,3}(a_0,a_1,a_2)\end{aligned}$$

where (i,j) is a permutation of $(1,2)$. □

Proposition 4.18. *If $\nu \neq 0 \neq \mu$, the pairings of $\mathscr{N}^\dagger$ are given by the table* (4.1)*.*

Proof. Considering remark 4.16, the definition of $\Phi^*\varphi_{i,3}$ and the previous lemma, we clearly have

$$\langle[\mathscr{N}^{\dagger\,c}_{\mu,\nu}], \varphi_{j,3}\rangle = \langle[\mathscr{N}^{\dagger\,c}_{\mu,\nu}], \Phi^*\varphi'_{i,3}\rangle = \langle[\mathscr{N}^c_{\nu,\mu}], \varphi_{i,3}\rangle.$$

Since 4.1 gives us the values of the pairings $\langle[\mathscr{N}^c_{\nu,\mu}], \varphi'_{1,3}\rangle$ and $\langle[\mathscr{N}^c_{\nu,\mu}], \varphi'_{2,3}\rangle$, we get

$$\langle[\mathscr{N}^{\dagger\,c}_{\mu,\nu}], \varphi_{1,3}\rangle = 0 \qquad\qquad \langle[\mathscr{N}^{\dagger\,c}_{\mu,\nu}], \varphi_{2,3}\rangle = -i2\pi.$$

□

5 Unitaries and First Odd Pairings

The inclusion $A \hookrightarrow D^c_{\mu,\nu}$ induces 2 elements of $K_1(D^c_{\mu,\nu})$:

$$U_1(p,x,y) = \delta_{0,p}e(x) \qquad\qquad U_2(p,x,y) = \delta_{0,p}e(y)$$

We want to construct a third unitary. As a first step, notice that the definition 2.4 entails:

$$\forall \xi \in M, \forall a \in A, \qquad\qquad \xi a = \sigma(a)\xi. \tag{5.1}$$

Corollary 5.1. *For all $\xi, \zeta \in M^c_{\mu,\nu} \subseteq D^c_{\mu,\nu}$, $\sigma(\xi^*\zeta) = \zeta\xi^*$.*

Proof. The definition of $M^c_{\mu,\nu}$ ensures that $a\xi = \xi\sigma(a)$ for all $a \in A$. Using the elements ξ_1, ξ_2 of proposition 2.6, we can write:

$$\sigma(\xi^*\zeta)(\xi_1\xi_1^* + \xi_2\xi_2^*) = \xi_1\xi^*\zeta\xi_1^* + \xi_2\xi^*\zeta\xi_2^* = \zeta\xi_1^*\xi_1\xi^* + \zeta\xi_2^*\xi_2\xi^* = \zeta\xi^*,$$

using the commutativity of A. ☐

Remark 5.2. The automorphism σ of A can be extended to an automorphism of D, also noted σ. It suffices to set $\sigma = \alpha_{(2\mu,2\nu,0)}$.

Proposition 5.3. *Let*

$$M_+ = \begin{pmatrix} \xi_1 & 0 \\ -\xi_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \qquad\qquad M_- = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sigma(\xi_2)^* \\ 0 & \sigma(\xi_1)^* \end{pmatrix}.$$

We get the relations:

$$\begin{aligned} M_+M_+^* = P_+ &= \begin{pmatrix} \xi_1\xi_1^* & -\xi_1\xi_2^* \\ -\xi_2\xi_1^* & \xi_2\xi_2^* \end{pmatrix} & M_+^*M_+ = Q_+ &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ M_-M_-^* = P_- &= \begin{pmatrix} \sigma(\xi_2^*\xi_2) & \sigma(\xi_2^*\xi_1) \\ \sigma(\xi_1^*\xi_2) & \sigma(\xi_1^*\xi_1) \end{pmatrix} & M_-^*M_- = Q_- &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{array}{cccc} P_\pm = P_\pm^2 = P_\pm^* & P_+ + P_- = I_2 & Q_\pm = Q_\pm^2 = Q_\pm^* & Q_+ + Q_- = I_2 \\ P_\pm M_\pm = M_\pm & M_\pm Q_\pm = M_\pm & M_\pm M_\mp^* = 0 & M_\pm^* M_\mp = 0 \end{array}$$

Thus $U_3 = M_+ + M_-$ is a unitary.

We will compute the index of this element in proposition 7.1 and make further remarks on this element in section A.

Proof. The first four relations are proved by direct calculation. The relations between the $Q_\pm$ are obvious. The $P_\pm$ are clearly self-adjoint. A direct computation using $\xi_1\xi_1^* + \xi_2\xi_2^* = \sum_{i=1}^2 {}_A\langle \xi_i, \xi_i\rangle = 1$ shows that $P_-^2 = P_-$.

Let us now show that $P_+ + P_- = I_2$, which proves the relations between $P_\pm$:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \xi_1\xi_1^* & -\xi_1\xi_2^* \\ -\xi_2\xi_1^* & \xi_2\xi_2^* \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \sigma(\xi_2^*\xi_2) & \sigma(\xi_2^*\xi_1) \\ \sigma(\xi_1^*\xi_2) & \sigma(\xi_1^*\xi_1) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \xi_1\xi_1^* + \xi_2\xi_2^* & -\xi_1\xi_2^* + \xi_1\xi_2^* \\ -\xi_2\xi_1^* + \xi_2\xi_1^* & \xi_2\xi_2^* + \xi_1\xi_1^* \end{pmatrix} = I_2,$$

through a systematic use of corollary 5.1. Finally, developping

$$(M_\pm Q_\pm - M_\pm)^*(M_\pm Q_\pm - M_\pm) = (Q_\pm M_\pm^* - M_\pm^*)(M_\pm Q_\pm - M_\pm) = 0$$

ensures that $M_\pm Q_\pm = M_\pm$. Now $P_\pm M_\pm = M_\pm M_\pm^* M_\pm = M_\pm Q_\pm = M_\pm$, and

$$M_\pm M_\mp^* = M_\pm Q_\pm Q_\mp M_\mp^* = 0 \qquad\qquad M_\pm^* M_\mp = M_\pm^* P_\pm P_\mp M_\mp = 0.$$

☐

The definition of odd pairings can be found in [9] III.3 proposition 3:

Definition 5.4 (Chern-Connes pairings)**.** The following formula defines a bilinear pairing between $K_1(\mathscr{A})$ and $HC^n(\mathscr{A})$:

$$\langle [u], [\phi] \rangle = \frac{2^{-n}}{\sqrt{2i}} \Gamma\left(\frac{n}{2}+1\right)^{-1} (\phi \# \operatorname{Tr})(u^*-1, u-1, u^*-1, \dots, u-1) \tag{5.2}$$

where $n = 2m+1$, $[U] \in K_1$ and $\phi \in ZC^{2m+1}$. These pairings satisfy $\langle [u], [S\phi] \rangle = \langle [u], [\phi] \rangle$.

Theorem 5.5. *Using the previous unitaries U_i, the values of the pairings are given by the table:*

	φ_1	φ_2	φ_3	$\varphi_{1,2,3}$
$[U_1]$	$-\sqrt{i2\pi}$	0	0	0
$[U_2]$	0	$-\sqrt{i2\pi}$	0	0
$[U_3]$	$\sqrt{i2\pi}\,2c\nu$	$-\sqrt{i2\pi}\,2c\mu$	0	$(i2\pi)^{3/2}c/3$

(5.3)

The proof of these results will occupy the next two sections.

Proposition 5.6. *The pairings with U_1 and U_2 are given by the first two lines of* (5.3)*.*

Proof. For $i = 1, 2$ and $j = 1, 2, 3$, let us evaluate:

$$\langle [U_i], [\varphi_j] \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2i\pi}} \tau\big((U_i^*-1)\partial_j(U_i-1)\big) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2i\pi}} \tau\big(U_i^* \partial_j(U_i)\big),$$

using $\tau(\partial_j(X)) = 0$ and $\partial_j(1) = 0$. The explicit expressions of ∂_j in degree 0 and U_i yields:

$$\langle [U_i], [\varphi_j] \rangle = -\delta_{i,j}\sqrt{2i\pi}.$$

The pairings with $\varphi_{1,2,3}$ are given by:

$$\langle [U_i], \varphi_{1,2,3} \rangle = \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_3} \varepsilon(\sigma) \tau\Big((U_i^*-1)\partial_{\sigma(1)}(U_i-1)\partial_{\sigma(2)}(U_i^*-1)\partial_{\sigma(3)}(U_i-1)\Big).$$

Each term of the above sum contains a vanishing derivation, hence $\langle [U_i], \varphi_{1,2,3} \rangle = 0$. ☐

To evaluate the other odd pairings, we need to estimate the commutation relations between α and the derivations ∂_i:

Notation 5.7. We use the notation $\partial_{(u,v,w)} = u\partial_1 + v\partial_2 + w\partial_3$.

Proposition 5.8. *The equality*

$$\alpha_{r,s,t}\big(\partial_{(u,v,w)}(F)\big) = \partial_{(u',v',w')}\big(\alpha_{r,s,t}(F)\big)$$

is fulfilled if and only if

$$u = u' \qquad v = v' \qquad w = w' + c(v'r - su') \tag{5.4}$$

Proof. This is a straightforward computation. ☐

Proposition 5.9. *The pairings of U_3 with the degree* 1 *cocycles are given by* (5.3)*.*

Proof. To simplify notations, we write ∂ and φ instead of ∂_i and φ_i. Remember that $U_3 = M_+ + M_-$:

$$\sqrt{2i\pi}\langle U_3, \varphi\rangle = \tau((M_+^* + M_-^* - 1)\partial(M_+ + M_-)) = \tau((M_+^* + M_-^*)\partial(M_+ + M_-))$$

because $\tau(\partial(M_+ + M_-)) = 0$. The trace vanishes on nonzero degree elements, hence we keep only the degree 0 terms of the expression:

$$\sqrt{2i\pi}\langle U_3, \varphi\rangle = \tau(M_+^*\partial M_+ + M_-^*\partial M_-).$$

Explicit computations yields:

$$M_+^*\partial M_+ = \begin{pmatrix} \xi_1^*\partial\xi_1 + \xi_2^*\partial\xi_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad M_-^*\partial M_- = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma(\xi_2)\partial\sigma(\xi_2^*) + \sigma(\xi_1)\partial\sigma(\xi_1^*) \end{pmatrix}.$$

The commutation relations $\partial\sigma(F) = \sigma(\partial(F) + k\partial_3(F))$ holds for all $\partial_i, i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, but with different constants k_i. Proposition 5.8 ensures

$$k_1 = -2c\nu \qquad\qquad k_2 = 2c\mu \qquad\qquad k_3 = 0.$$

Upon integrating the commutations relations in the trace of $M_+^*\partial M_+$:

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma(\xi_1)\sigma(\partial\xi_1^* + k\partial_3(\xi_1^*)) + \sigma(\xi_2)\sigma(\partial\xi_2^* + k\partial_3(\xi_2^*)) = \\ = \sigma\big(\xi_1\partial(\xi_1^*) + \xi_2\partial(\xi_2^*) + k(\xi_1\partial_3(\xi_1^*) + \xi_2\partial_3(\xi_2^*))\big).\end{aligned}$$

Yet $\partial_3(\xi_i^*) = -i2\pi\xi_i^*$ and $\xi_1\xi_1^* + \xi_2\xi_2^* = 1$, so:

$$\begin{aligned}\sqrt{2i\pi}\langle U_3, \varphi\rangle &= \tau(\xi_1^*\partial\xi_1 + \xi_2^*\partial\xi_2) + \tau\big(\sigma(\xi_1\partial\xi_1^* + \xi_2\partial\xi_2^*)\big) - i2\pi k \\ &= \tau\big(\xi_1^*\partial\xi_1 + \xi_2^*\partial\xi_2 + \sigma(\xi_1\partial\xi_1^* + \xi_2\partial\xi_2^*)\big) - i2\pi k \\ &= \tau\big(\xi_1^*\partial\xi_1 + \xi_2^*\partial\xi_2 + \partial(\xi_1^*)\xi_1 + \partial(\xi_2^*)\xi_2\big) - i2\pi k \\ &= \tau\big(\partial(\xi_1^*\xi_1 + \xi_2^*\xi_2)\big) - i2\pi k = \tau(\partial(1)) - i2\pi k,\end{aligned}$$

where we applied corollary 5.1. Taking into account the different values of k_i:

$$\langle U_3, \varphi_1\rangle = \sqrt{2i\pi}\ 2c\nu \qquad \langle U_3, \varphi_2\rangle = -\sqrt{2i\pi}\ 2c\mu \qquad \langle U_3, \varphi_3\rangle = 0.$$

□

6 Top Degree Pairing

Proposition 6.1. *The pairing* $\langle [U_3], \varphi_{1,2,3}\rangle$ *is given by the table* (5.3).

The proof of this proposition will fill the remainder of this section. Setting $\mathcal{U} = U_3 = M_+ + M_-$, we want to evaluate:

$$\langle [U_3], \varphi_{1,2,3}\rangle = \frac{1}{8\sqrt{2i}}\frac{4}{3\sqrt{\pi}}\sum_{\sigma\in\Sigma_3}\varepsilon(\sigma)T_{\sigma(1)\sigma(2)\sigma(3)} \tag{6.1}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}T_{ijk} &= \tau\big((\mathcal{U}^* - 1)\partial_i(\mathcal{U} - 1)\partial_j(\mathcal{U}^* - 1)\partial_k(\mathcal{U} - 1)\big) \\ &= \tau\big((\mathcal{U}^* - 1)\partial_i(\mathcal{U})\partial_j(\mathcal{U}^*)\partial_k(\mathcal{U})\big).\end{aligned}$$

All the following terms have odd degree – and therefore vanishing trace:

$$\tau\big(\partial_i(\mathcal{U})\partial_j(\mathcal{U}^*)\partial_k(\mathcal{U})\big) = \tau\big(\partial_i(M_+ + M_-)\partial_j(M_+^* + M_-^*)\partial_k(M_+ + M_-)\big) = 0.$$

Lemma 6.2. *The following relations hold:*

$$\partial_i(M_\pm)M^*_\mp = -M_\pm\partial_i(M^*_\mp) \qquad \partial_i(M^*_\pm)P_\mp = -M^*_\pm\partial_i(P_\mp) \tag{6.2}$$

$$\tau\big(P_\mp\partial_i(M_\pm)\partial_j(M^*_\pm)\big) = \tau\big(P_\pm\partial_j(P_\pm)\partial_i(P_\pm)\big) \tag{6.3}$$

$$\tau\big(P_\pm\partial_i(M_\pm)\partial_j(M^*_\pm)\big) = \tau\big(\partial_i(M_\pm)\partial_j(M^*_\pm) + P_\pm\partial_j(P_\pm)\partial_i(P_\pm)\big) \tag{6.4}$$

Beware of permutations between i and j in the equations (6.3) and (6.4) !

Proof. The first series can be proved by integration by parts:

$$\partial_i(M_\pm)M^*_\mp = \partial_i(M_\pm M^*_\mp) - M_\pm\partial_i(M^*_\mp) = -M_\pm\partial_i(M^*_\mp)$$

because (lemma 5.3) $M_\pm M^*_\mp = 0$. We also have $M^*_\pm P_\mp = M^*_\pm P_\pm P_\mp = 0$, which enables to prove the second equality of (6.2) using the same method. Now

$$\begin{aligned}\tau(P_\mp\partial_i(M_\pm)\partial_j(M^*_\pm)) &= \tau(\partial_j(M^*_\pm)P_\mp\partial_i(M_\pm)) = \\ &= -\tau\big(M^*_\pm\partial_j(P_\mp)\partial_i(M_\pm)\big) = \tau\big(M^*_\pm\partial_j(P_\pm)\partial_i(M_\pm)\big) \\ &= \tau\Big(M^*_\pm\partial_j(P_\pm)\big(\partial_i(P_\pm)M_\pm + P_\pm\partial_i(M_\pm)\big)\Big) = \\ &= \tau\Big(P_\pm\partial_j(P_\pm)\partial_i(P_\pm) + M^*_\pm P_\pm\partial_j(P_\pm)P_\pm\partial_i(M_\pm)\Big) = \\ &= \tau(P_\pm\partial_j(P_\pm)\partial_i(P_\pm)),\end{aligned}$$

using (6.2), $\partial_i(P_\mp) = -\partial_i(P_\pm)$ and $P_\pm\partial_i(P_\pm)P_\pm = 0$. This last equality is true because $P_\pm$ is an idempotent and ∂_i a derivation.

Regarding the last equation:

$$\begin{aligned}\tau\big(P_\pm\partial_i(M_\pm)\partial_j(M^*_\pm)\big) &= \tau\big((\partial_i(P_\pm M_\pm) - \partial_i(P_\pm)M_\pm)\partial_j(M^*_\pm)\big) = \\ &= \tau\big(\partial_i(M_\pm)\partial_j(M^*_\pm) - \partial_i(P_\pm)M_\pm\partial_j(M^*_\pm)P_\pm + \partial_i(P_\pm)M_\pm M^*_\pm\partial_j(P_\pm)\big) = \\ &= \tau\big(\partial_i(M_\pm)\partial_j(M^*_\pm) - P_\pm\partial_i(P_\pm)P_\pm M_\pm\partial_j(M^*_\pm) + P_\pm\partial_j(P_\pm)\partial_i(P_\pm)\big) = \\ &= \tau\big(\partial_i(M_\pm)\partial_j(M^*_\pm) + P_\pm\partial_j(P_\pm)\partial_i(P_\pm)\big),\end{aligned}$$

possible because $M^*_\pm = M^*_\pm P_\pm$. ☐

We will also need the following lemma:

Lemma 6.3. *If* $(i,j) = (1,2)$ *or* $(2,1)$, *we have both*

$$\tau(\partial_i(\mathcal{U})\partial_j(\mathcal{U}^*)) = \tau\big(\partial_i(M_+)\partial_j(M^*_+) + \partial_i(M_-)\partial_j(M^*_-)\big)$$

and

$$\tau\big(\partial_1(\mathcal{U})\partial_2(\mathcal{U}^*) - \partial_2(\mathcal{U})\partial_1(\mathcal{U}^*)\big) = 0.$$

Proof. The first equality is obvious by keeping only the degree 0 terms in

$$\tau(\partial_i(\mathcal{U})\partial_j(\mathcal{U}^*)) = \tau\big(\partial_i(M_+ + M_-)\partial_j(M^*_+ + M^*_-)\big).$$

The second one is obtained by integration by parts:

$$\begin{aligned}&\tau\big(\partial_1(\mathcal{U})\partial_2(\mathcal{U}^*) - \partial_2(\mathcal{U})\partial_1(\mathcal{U}^*)\big) = \\ &\quad = \tau\Big(\partial_1\big(\mathcal{U}\partial_2(\mathcal{U}^*)\big) - \mathcal{U}\partial_1\partial_2(\mathcal{U}^*) - \partial_2\big(\mathcal{U}\partial_1(\mathcal{U}^*)\big) + \mathcal{U}\partial_2\partial_1(\mathcal{U}^*)\Big) = \\ &\qquad = c\tau\big(\mathcal{U}\partial_3(\mathcal{U}^*)\big) = 0,\end{aligned}$$

using $[\partial_1, \partial_2] = -c\partial_3$ and $\langle\varphi_3, \mathcal{U}\rangle = 0$. ☐

6.0.1 Terms T_{132} and T_{231}

Using the identity $\partial_3(M_\pm^*) = \mp i2\pi M_\pm^*$, we can evaluate T_{231}:

$$\begin{aligned} T_{231} &= -i2\pi\tau\big((M_+^* + M_-^*)\partial_2(\mathcal{U})(M_+^* - M_-^*)\partial_1(\mathcal{U})\big) \\ &= -i2\pi\tau\Big(M_+^*\partial_2(\mathcal{U})M_+^*\partial_1(\mathcal{U}) - M_+^*\partial_2(\mathcal{U})M_-^*\partial_1(\mathcal{U}) \\ &\qquad\qquad + M_-^*\partial_2(\mathcal{U})M_+^*\partial_1(\mathcal{U}) - M_-^*\partial_2(\mathcal{U})M_-^*\partial_1(\mathcal{U})\Big). \end{aligned}$$

Same thing for T_{132}:

$$\begin{aligned} T_{132} &= -i2\pi\tau\big((M_+^* + M_-^*)\partial_1(\mathcal{U})(M_+^* - M_-^*)\partial_2(\mathcal{U})\big) \\ &= -i2\pi\tau\Big(M_+^*\partial_1(\mathcal{U})M_+^*\partial_2(\mathcal{U}) - M_+^*\partial_1(\mathcal{U})M_-^*\partial_2(\mathcal{U}) \\ &\qquad\qquad + M_-^*\partial_1(\mathcal{U})M_+^*\partial_2(\mathcal{U}) - M_-^*\partial_1(\mathcal{U})M_-^*\partial_2(\mathcal{U})\Big). \end{aligned}$$

Taking into account the $\varepsilon(\sigma)$ of (6.1) and the fact that τ is a trace,

$$T_{231} - T_{132} = i4\pi\tau\Big(M_+^*\partial_2(\mathcal{U})M_-^*\partial_1(\mathcal{U}) - M_-^*\partial_2(\mathcal{U})M_+^*\partial_1(\mathcal{U})\Big).$$

As $\mathcal{U} = M_+ + M_-$, we can put both terms in the general form:

$$\tau\big(M_+^*\partial_i(M_+ + M_-)M_-^*\partial_j(M_+ + M_-)\big).$$

Keeping only elements of total degree 0:

$$\tau\big(M_+^*\partial_i(M_+)M_-^*\partial_j(M_-) + M_+^*\partial_i(M_-)M_-^*\partial_j(M_+)\big)$$

The first term integrates by parts:

$$\big(\partial_i(M_+^*M_+) - \partial_i(M_+^*)M_+\big)M_-^*\partial_j(M_-),$$

which vanishes because $\partial_i(M_+^*M_+) = \partial_i(Q_+) = 0$ and $M_+M_-^* = 0$. For the second term,

$$\begin{aligned} &\tau\Big(M_+^*\big(\partial_i(\underbrace{M_-M_-^*}_{=P_-}) - M_-\partial_i(M_-^*)\big)\partial_j(M_+)\Big) = \tau\big(M_+^*\partial_i(P_-)\partial_j(M_+)\big) = \\ &= -\tau\big(\partial_i(M_+^*)P_-\partial_j(M_+)\big) = -\tau\big(P_-\partial_j(M_+)\partial_i(M_+^*)\big) = -\tau(P_+\partial_i(P_+)\partial_j(P_+)) \end{aligned}$$

applying (6.2), trace property and then (6.3).

Therefore, the contribution of T_{132} and T_{231} is

$$T_{231} - T_{132} = -i4\pi\tau\big(P_+(\partial_2P_+\partial_1P_+ - \partial_1P_+\partial_2P_+)\big).$$

6.0.2 Terms T_{123} and T_{213}

As $\partial_3(M_\pm) = \pm i2\pi M_\pm$, the terms T_{123} and T_{213} can be written:

$$\begin{aligned} T_{ij3} &= i2\pi\tau\big((M_+^* + M_-^*)\partial_i(\mathcal{U})\partial_j(\mathcal{U}^*)(M_+ - M_-)\big) = \\ &\qquad = i2\pi\tau\big((P_+ - P_-)\partial_i(\mathcal{U})\partial_j(\mathcal{U}^*)\big) = i2\pi\tau\big((2P_+ - I_2)\partial_i(\mathcal{U})\partial_j(\mathcal{U}^*)\big) \end{aligned}$$

Taking the difference $T_{123} - T_{213}$, then using lemma 6.3, the expression becomes:

$$T_{123} - T_{213} = i4\pi\tau\Big(P_+\big(\partial_1(\mathcal{U})\partial_2(\mathcal{U}^*) - \partial_2(\mathcal{U})\partial_1(\mathcal{U}^*)\big)\Big).$$

Let us study the term

$$\begin{aligned}\tau\big(P_+\partial_i(M_+ + M_-)\partial_j(M_+^* + M_-^*)\big) &= \tau\Big(P_+\big(\partial_i(M_+)\partial_j(M_+^*) + \partial_i(M_-)\partial_j(M_-^*)\big)\Big)\\ &= \tau\big(\partial_i(M_+)\partial_j(M_+) + P_+\partial_j(P_+)\partial_i(P_+) + P_-\partial_j(P_-)\partial_i(P_-)\big) = \\ &\qquad = \tau\big(\partial_i(M_+)\partial_j(M_+^*) + \partial_j(P_+)\partial_i(P_+)\big),\end{aligned}$$

using the equations (6.4) and (6.3), and then $\partial_i(P_-)\partial_j(P_-) = \partial_i(P_+)\partial_j(P_+)$. Next,

$$\tau(\partial_1(P_+)\partial_2(P_+) - \partial_2(P_+)\partial_1(P_+)) = 0$$

because τ is a trace.

Finally, the contribution of the terms T_{123} and T_{213} is

$$T_{123} - T_{213} = i4\pi\tau\Big(\partial_1(M_+)\partial_2(M_+^*) - \partial_2(M_+)\partial_1(M_+^*)\Big).$$

6.0.3 Termes T_{312} and T_{321}

Lemma 6.4. *The analogs of 6.2 hold.*

$$Q_\mp\partial_i M_\pm^* = -\partial_i(Q_\mp)M_\pm^* = 0 \qquad\qquad Q_\pm\partial_i M_\pm^* = \partial_i(M_\pm^*) \tag{6.5}$$

$$Q_\mp\partial_i(M_\pm^*)\partial_j(M_\pm) = 0 \tag{6.6}$$

$$Q_\pm\partial_i(M_\pm^*)\partial_j(M_\pm) = \partial_i(M_\pm^*)\partial_j(M_\pm) \tag{6.7}$$

Proof. For the first series of relations,

$$Q_\mp\partial_i M_\pm^* = \partial_i(Q_\mp M_\pm^*) - \partial_i(Q_\mp)M_\pm^* = 0$$

because $Q_\mp M_\pm^* = Q_\mp Q_\pm M_\pm^* = 0$ and $\partial(Q_\pm) = 0$. Likewise,

$$Q_\pm\partial_i M_\pm^* = \partial_i(Q_\pm M_\pm^*) - \partial_i(Q_\pm)M_\pm^* = \partial_i(M_\pm^*),$$

thanks to $Q_\pm M_\pm^* = M_\pm^*$. For the second series,

$$\tau(Q_\mp\partial_i(M_\pm^*)\partial_j(M_\pm)) = -\tau(\partial_j(Q_\mp)M_\pm^*\partial_i(M_\pm)) = 0,$$

using the previous relations. The third relation is obvious starting from 6.5. ☐

The terms T_{312} and T_{321} can be written:

$$\begin{aligned}T_{3ij} &= i2\pi\tau\big((M_+^* + M_-^*)(M_+ - M_-)\partial_i(\mathcal{U}^*)\partial_j(\mathcal{U})\big) = \\ &\qquad i2\pi\tau\big((Q_+ - Q_-)\partial_i(\mathcal{U}^*)\partial_j(\mathcal{U})\big) = i2\pi\tau\big((2Q_+ - I_2)\partial_i(\mathcal{U}^*)\partial_j(\mathcal{U})\big).\end{aligned}$$

Taking the difference $T_{312} - T_{321}$, then using lemma 6.3, we get:

$$T_{312} - T_{321} = i4\pi\tau\Big(Q_+\big(\partial_1(\mathcal{U}^*)\partial_2(\mathcal{U}) - \partial_2(\mathcal{U}^*)\partial_1(\mathcal{U})\big)\Big).$$

Let us study the following term

$$\begin{aligned}&\tau\big(Q_+\partial_i(M_+^*+M_-^*)\partial_j(M_++M_-)\big) =\\ &\qquad = \tau\big(Q_+(\partial_i(M_+^*)\partial_j(M_+)+\partial_i(M_-^*)\partial_j(M_-)\big) = \tau\big(\partial_i(M_+^*)\partial_j(M_+)\big).\end{aligned}$$

The difference can thus be written:

$$T_{312}-T_{321} = i4\pi\tau\Big(\partial_1(M_+^*)\partial_2(M_+)-\partial_2(M_+^*)\partial_1(M_+)\Big).$$

6.0.4 Synthesis and Final Computation

Forming the synthesis of the studied terms:

$$\begin{aligned}6\sqrt{2i\pi}\,\langle[U_3],\varphi_{1,2,3}\rangle &= \big(T_{231}-T_{132}+T_{123}-T_{213}+T_{312}-T_{321}\big)\\ &= i4\pi\tau\big(P_+(\partial_1P_+\partial_2P_+-\partial_2P_+\partial_1P_+)\big)\\ &\quad i4\pi\tau\Big(\partial_1(M_+)\partial_2(M_+^*)-\partial_2(M_+)\partial_1(M_+^*)\Big)\\ &\quad i4\pi\tau\Big(\partial_1(M_+^*)\partial_2(M_+)-\partial_2(M_+^*)\partial_1(M_+)\Big)\\ &= i4\pi\tau\big(P_+(\partial_1P_+\partial_2P_+-\partial_2P_+\partial_1P_+)\big)\\ &= i4\pi\,\langle[P_+],[\varphi_{1,2}]\rangle\end{aligned}$$

This expression is a coupling on the algebra $A = C(T^2)$. We can compute it using a connexion.

First identify the module of $C(T^2)$ which corresponds to the projector P_+.

Lemma 6.5. *The module P_+A^2 is isomorphic to $(M_{0,0}^{-c})_A$.*

Notice that we only need an identification as *module*, and not as *bimodule*.

Notation 6.6. We denote the elements of $M_{0,0}^{-c}$ by ζ^*. More generally, we include $M_{0,0}^{-c}$ into $D_{0,0}^{c}$ in the following computation.

Proof. To identify the module M associated to P_+, the simplest thing is to interpret M_+^* and M_+ respectively as maps $P_+A^2 \to M$ and $M \to P_+A^2$. Formally, we introduce the maps $\Phi : P_+A^2 \to M_{0,0}^{-c}$ and $\Psi : M_{0,0}^{-c} \to P_+A^2$:

$$\Phi\begin{pmatrix}a_1\\a_2\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}\xi_1^* & -\xi_2^*\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}a_1\\a_2\end{pmatrix} \qquad\qquad \Psi(\zeta^*) = \begin{pmatrix}\xi_1\\-\xi_2\end{pmatrix}\zeta^*.$$

Using the properties of M_+ and M_+^*, we see that the maps Φ and Ψ are inverse to one another, and that they preserve the scalar products. ☐

The following result is well known:

Proposition 6.7. *The pairing of M^{-c} with $\varphi_{1,2}$ is given by:*

$$\langle[M_{0,0}^{-c}],[\varphi_{1,2}]\rangle = i2\pi c$$

This proposition enables us to complete the computation of $\langle[U_3],[\varphi_{1,2,3}]\rangle$:

$$\langle[U_3],[\varphi_{1,2,3}]\rangle = \frac{i4\pi}{6\sqrt{i2\pi}}i2\pi c = c\frac{(i2\pi)^{3/2}}{3}$$

7 Consequences of the Pairings

An immediate consequence of (3.2) and table (5.3) is that (U_1, U_2, U_3) form a basis of $K_1(D) \otimes \mathbb{C}$. It is therefore natural to wonder if these elements generate $K_1(D)$. The answer is no.

To prove the above, first notice that since the QHM are Pimsner algebras associated to the Hilbert bimodule M^c, their K-theory fit in the 6-terms exact sequence (see [20]):

$$\begin{tikzcd}
K_0(A) \arrow[r, "\mathrm{Id}-{[M^c]}"] & K_0(A) \arrow[r, "\iota"] & K_0(D) \arrow[d, "\partial"] \\
K_1(D) \arrow[u, "\partial"] & K_1(A) \arrow[l, "\iota"] & K_1(A) \arrow[l, "\mathrm{Id}-{[M^c]}"]
\end{tikzcd} \tag{7.1}$$

To establish this exact sequence, Pimsner's approach is in fact to start with a short exact sequence

$$0 \to J \to \mathcal{T}_M \to D \to 0 \tag{7.2}$$

and to prove that both J and $\mathcal{T}_M$ are KK-equivalent to A. The algebra $\mathcal{T}_M$ was defined in [20]. In our special case, one can prove (see section A) that $\mathcal{T}_M$ can be identified with the $*$-subalgebra of $\mathcal{T} \otimes D$ generated by $1 \otimes a$ and $S \otimes \xi$ for $a \in A$ and $\xi \in M$. Notice that $\mathcal{T}$ is a nuclear C^*-algebra, thus we don't need to specify which C^*-norm we are taking in the tensor product. We identify $\mathcal{T}$ with the unital C^*-algebra generated by the projector P and the isometry S with the relations

$$SS^* = 1 - P \qquad\qquad S^*S = 1.$$

To prove that (U_1, U_2, U_3) does not generate $K_1(D)$, we study their images by the index map $\partial\colon K_1(D) \to K_0(A)$.

Proposition 7.1. *The index map of the U_i is given by:*

$$\partial(U_1) = 0 \qquad\qquad \partial(U_2) = 0 \qquad\qquad \partial(U_3) = [Q_-] \ominus [P_+]$$

with the notation of proposition 5.3.

Proof. Since U_1 and U_2 come from the inclusion $A \hookrightarrow D$, the first two equalities are clear.

Regarding the last equality, we are really going to compute the index map in the 6-term exact sequence associated to (7.2) and then translate the result in terms of K-theory of A.

It is readily checked that

$$\mathbb{U}_3 = \begin{pmatrix} S \otimes M_+ + S^* \otimes M_- & P \otimes P_+ \\ P \otimes Q_- & S^* \otimes M_+^* + S \otimes M_-^* \end{pmatrix}$$

is a unitary lift of U_3 in $\mathcal{T}_M$. It is then easy to complete the index computation:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{U} \begin{pmatrix} 1_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \mathbb{U}^* = \\
&\quad = \begin{pmatrix} S \otimes M_+ + S^* \otimes M_- & 0 \\ P \otimes Q_- & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} S^* \otimes M_+^* + S \otimes M_-^* & P \otimes Q_- \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \\
&\qquad\qquad \begin{pmatrix} 1 \otimes 1 - P \otimes P_+ & 0 \\ 0 & P \otimes Q_- \end{pmatrix}
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the index of U_3 in J is $P \otimes Q_- - P \otimes P_+$, which is the image of $Q_- \ominus P_+$ in J. The KK-equivalence between A and J then entails $\partial(U_3) = Q_- \ominus P_+$. ☐

In [21], Rieffel has given an explicit description of the finitely generated projective modules over $C(T^2)$. He proves that $K_0(A)$ can be identified with the pairs (d,t) where d (dimension) and t (twist) are in $\mathbb{Z}$. We can choose the definition of the twist such that $[M^c] \simeq (1,c)$, and thus $[P_+] = (1,-c)$.

From this identification, together with the proposition 3.10 of [21], we see that

$$\mathrm{Id} - [M] : (d,t) \mapsto (d,t) - (d, t+cd) = (0, -cd)$$

Thus the kernel of $\mathrm{Id} - [M]$ is generated by $(0,1)$. As $\partial(U_3) = [Q_-] \ominus [P_+] \simeq (0,c)$, *$U_3$ is not a generator of $K_1(D)$.*

Another consequence of proposition 7.1 and the previous computation is

Corollary 7.2. *For any $U \in K_1(D)$,*

$$\langle [U], \varphi_{1,2,3} \rangle = \frac{-\sqrt{i2\pi}}{3} \langle \partial[U], \varphi_{1,2} \rangle. \tag{7.3}$$

Proof. Since the pairing is bilinear, we only have to check this on a basis of $K_1(D) \otimes \mathbb{C}$. The equality is true for $U = U_1$ and $U = U_2$, since $\partial(U_i) = 0$.

For U_3, notice that $\langle [Q_-], \varphi_{1,2,3} \rangle = \langle [1], \varphi_{1,2,3} \rangle = 0$. Hence

$$\langle [U_3], \varphi_{1,2,3} \rangle = \frac{-i4\pi}{6\sqrt{i2\pi}} \langle -[P_+], \varphi_{1,2} \rangle = \frac{-\sqrt{i2\pi}}{3} \langle \partial(U_3), \varphi_{1,2} \rangle.$$

☐

The formula (7.3) enables us to prove further properties of the pairing with $\varphi_{1,2,3}$:

Corollary 7.3. *There is a K-homology element $K' \in K^1(D)$ such that for any $[U] \in K_1(D)$,*

$$\langle [U], \varphi_{1,2,3} \rangle = \frac{(i2\pi)^{3/2}}{3} \langle [U], K' \rangle.$$

In particular, this pairing takes only integer values, as one can check by direct examination of (5.3).

Proof. We know that in $A = C(T^2)$, one can find a K-homology element K such that

$$\langle [E], \varphi_{1,2} \rangle = -i2\pi \langle [E], K \rangle$$

for any $[E] \in K_0(A)$. It is known that in the 6-terms exact sequence (7.1), one can seen the boundary maps as multiplication by some element $\delta \in KK^1(D,A)$. Mutliplying $K \in K^0(A) = KK_0(A,\mathbb{C})$ by δ, we get $K' \in K^1(D)$ such that

$$i2\pi \langle [U], K' \rangle = i2\pi \langle \partial[U], K \rangle = -\langle \partial[U], \phi_{1,2} \rangle = \frac{3}{\sqrt{i2\pi}} \langle [U], \varphi_{1,2,3} \rangle.$$

☐

8 Dimension of $HP^*(\mathscr{D})$

To complete the description of $HP^*(\mathscr{D})$, it only remains to be proven that there are no extra cyclic cocycles. We therefore compute the dimension of $HP^0(\mathscr{D})$ and $HP^1(\mathscr{D})$. We stick to computation of pairings and periodic theory. We also use results from [14]: in this article, it is proved that the smooth QHM $\mathscr{D}$ fit in a short exact sequence of locally convex algebras. In this section, we denote by $\mathscr{A}$ the algebra $C^\infty(S^1)$ with its usual Fréchet algebra structure. We start with the following definition (see [12], 2.2 and 2.3):

Definition 8.1 (Smooth Toeplitz algebra)**.** The *smooth compact operators* $\mathcal{K}$ are the $\mathbb{N}\times\mathbb{N}$ matrices $(a_{i,j})$ with rapidly decreasing complex entries. The topology on $\mathcal{K}$ is given by the norms:

$$p_n\big((a_{i,j})\big) = \sum_{i,j} |1+i|^n |1+j|^n |a_{i,j}|.$$

The *smooth Toeplitz algebra* $\mathscr{T}$ is topologically the direct sum $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{K} \oplus C^\infty(S^1)$, where $C^\infty(S^1)$ is equipped with its usual Fréchet structure. The multiplication in $\mathscr{T}$ is described *via* an action of $\mathscr{T}$ on $s(\mathbb{N})$ (rapidly decreasing sequences). $\mathcal{K}$ acts in the natural way, and $C^\infty(S^1)$ by truncated convolution. The function $\sum a_k z^k$ acts on $(\xi_i) \in s(\mathbb{N})$ by:

$$(a\xi)_i = \sum_{k+j=i} a_k \xi_j.$$

The algebra $\mathscr{D}$ fits in the linearly split exact sequence:

$$0 \to \mathscr{J} \to \mathscr{T}_{\mathscr{M}} \xrightarrow{\pi} \mathscr{D} \to 0,$$

where $\mathscr{T}_{\mathscr{M}}$ is the subalgebra generated in the projective tensor product $\mathscr{T}\hat{\otimes}\mathscr{D}$ by $1\otimes a$, $S\otimes\xi$ and $S^*\otimes\xi^*$ for $a\in\mathscr{A}$ and $\xi\in\mathscr{M}$. The map π is defined on the generators by:

$$\pi(1\otimes a) = a \qquad \pi(S\otimes\xi) = \xi \qquad \pi(S^*\otimes\xi^*) = \xi^*.$$

From this short exact sequence, the article [13] ensures us that there is a 6-terms exact sequence in periodic cyclic cohomology:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
HP^0(\mathscr{J}) \arrow[d] & HP^0(\mathscr{T}_{\mathscr{M}}) \arrow[l] & HP^0(\mathscr{D}) \arrow[l, "\pi^*"'] \\
HP^1(\mathscr{D}) \arrow[r, "\pi^*"] & HP^1(\mathscr{T}_{\mathscr{M}}) \arrow[r] & HP^1(\mathscr{J}) \arrow[u]
\end{tikzcd} \tag{8.1}$$

It was also proved in [14] that there are kk-equivalences $\mathscr{T}_{\mathscr{M}} \simeq \mathscr{A}$ and $\mathscr{J} \simeq \mathscr{A}$. Consequently

$$HP^0(\mathscr{J}) = HP^0(\mathscr{T}_{\mathscr{M}}) = HP^0(\mathscr{A}) = \mathbb{C}^2 \tag{8.2}$$

$$HP^1(\mathscr{J}) = HP^1(\mathscr{T}_{\mathscr{M}}) = HP^1(\mathscr{A}) = \mathbb{C}^2. \tag{8.3}$$

Moreover, the inclusion $\mathscr{A} \hookrightarrow \mathscr{T}_{\mathscr{M}}$ induces an isomorphism at the level of K-theory. Hence the unitaries $V_i = 1\otimes U_i \in \mathscr{T}_{\mathscr{M}}$ form a generating set of $K_1(\mathscr{T}_{\mathscr{M}})$, and if E is a projector in $M_n(\mathscr{A})$ with dimension 1 and twisting 1, then $1\otimes 1$ and $1\otimes E$ are a generating set of $K_0(\mathscr{T}_{\mathscr{M}})$. These generating sets *separate* the periodic cyclic cocycles.

Let us now evaluate the image of π^* by computing pairings on $\mathscr{T}_{\mathscr{M}}$. In the odd case,

$$\langle V_i, \pi^* \varphi_j \rangle = \langle \pi_*(V_i), \varphi_j \rangle = \langle U_i, \varphi_j \rangle,$$

which together with (8.2) proves that $(\pi^* \varphi_j)_{j=1,2}$ is a basis of $HP^1(\mathscr{T}_{\mathscr{M}})$.

In the even case, our analyse of the map $\mathrm{Id} - [M^c]$ ensures that in $K_0(\mathscr{D})$ $\iota(E) \ominus \iota(1)$ is a torsion element. Here we used $\iota : \mathscr{A} \hookrightarrow \mathscr{D}$ to distinguish $E \in K_0(\mathscr{A})$ from $\iota(E) \in K_0(\mathscr{D})$. The definition of π guaranties $\pi(1 \otimes E) = \iota(E)$ and $\pi(1 \otimes 1) = \iota(1)$. The bilinearity of the pairing therefore enforces:

$$\langle 1 \otimes E, \pi^* \psi \rangle = \langle \iota(E), \psi \rangle = \langle \iota(1), \psi \rangle = \langle 1 \otimes 1, \pi^* \psi \rangle.$$

Since $1 \otimes 1$ and $1 \otimes E$ separate $HP^*(\mathscr{A})$, we see that $\pi^*\big(HP^0(\mathscr{D})\big)$ has dimension at most 1. It is easy to use the trace to check that the image is non zero.

Putting the above results in the exact sequence (8.1), we get:

Proposition 8.2. *The periodic cyclic cohomology of $\mathscr{D}$ is given by:*

$$HP^0(\mathscr{D}) = \mathbb{C}^3 \qquad\qquad HP^1(\mathscr{D}) = \mathbb{C}^3.$$

Yet, proposition 3.8 provided us with *7* cyclic cocycles. The tables (4.1) and (5.3) enable us to exhibit linearly independent families of cyclic cocycles. Notice that the pairing $\langle [K], [\varphi] \rangle$ only depends on the class of φ in *periodic cyclic cohomology* and thus the families are independent in $HP^*(\mathscr{D})$. Hence we get:

Theorem 8.3. *Taking the notations of proposition 3.8,*

- *the family $(\tau, \varphi_{1,3}, \varphi_{2,3})$ is a basis of $HP^0(\mathscr{D})$;*
- *the family $(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_{1,2,3})$ is a basis of $HP^1(\mathscr{D})$.*

It follows from [14] that the (tensorised) Chern character is an isomorphism for the QHM. As we know the K-theory of the QHM, we get:

$$HP_0(\mathscr{D}) = K_0(\mathscr{D}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{C} = \mathbb{C}^3 \qquad\qquad HP_1(\mathscr{D}) = K_1(\mathscr{D}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{C} = \mathbb{C}^3.$$

Since the Chern-Connes pairings factorise through the Chern-Character from K-theory to cyclic homology (see [18], section 8.3), we can describe the periodic cyclic homology. Notice that in the following we require $\mu \neq 0 \neq \nu$ so that the modules $\mathscr{N}$ and $\mathscr{N}^\dagger$ over $\mathscr{D}^c_{\mu,\nu}$ *exist* (see notation 4.11 and definition 4.15).

Theorem 8.4.
- *The family $(\mathrm{Ch}(U_1), \mathrm{Ch}(U_2), \mathrm{Ch}(U_3))$ is a basis of $HP_1(\mathscr{D})$.*
- *If $\mu \neq 0 \neq \nu$, then the family $\big(\mathrm{Ch}\left(\mathscr{D}^c_{\mu,\nu}\right), \mathrm{Ch}\left(\mathscr{N}^c_{\mu,\nu}\right), \mathrm{Ch}\left(\mathscr{N}^{\dagger c}_{\mu,\nu}\right)\big)$ is a basis of $HP_0(\mathscr{D}^c_{\mu,\nu})$.*

9 Final Remarks

Notice that if we have an element K of K-homology, the tables (5.3) and (4.1) are precisely what we need to determine the Chern character of K by simply computing its pairings with K-theory.

The previous discussion on linear independence in $HP^*(\mathscr{D})$ or $HC^*(\mathscr{D})$ is relevant because the cyclic cocycle φ_3 is nonzero in $HC^1(\mathscr{D})$ and $(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3)$ is linearly independent in $HC^1(\mathscr{D})$, yet $[\varphi_3] = 0$ in $HP^1(\mathscr{D})$.

More generally, we have the following proposition which ensures the linear independence of the cyclic cocycles of proposition 3.8:

Proposition 9.1. *The following Hochschild cycles are "dual" to the cocycles of proposition 3.8, in the sense that*

$$\langle c_k, \varphi_i \rangle = \delta_{k,i} k_i \qquad \langle c_{k,l}, \varphi_{i,j} \rangle = \delta_{i,k}\delta_{j,l} k_{i,j} \qquad \langle c_{1,2,3}, \varphi_{1,2,3} \rangle \neq 0,$$

for some nonzero constants $k_I \in \mathbb{C}$, where the Hochschild cycles are:

- *Degree 1:* $c_1 = U_1^* \otimes U_1$, $c_2 = U_2^* \otimes U_2$ *and* $c_3 = \xi_1^* \otimes \xi_1 + \xi_2^* \otimes \xi_2$
- *Degree 2: "skewsymmetrisation"* $c_{j,3}$ *of* $\sum_p \xi_p^* U_j^* \otimes U_j \otimes \xi_p$*:*

$$c_{j,3} = \sum_{p=1}^{2} \xi_p^* U_j^* \otimes U_j \otimes \xi_p - U_j^* \xi_p^* \otimes \xi_p \otimes U_j$$

- *Degree 3: setting* $U_{p,j}$ *equal to* U_j *for* $j = 1, 2$ *and equal to* ξ_p *for* $j = 3$,

$$c_{1,2,3} = \sum_{p=1}^{2} \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_3} \varepsilon(\sigma) U^*_{p,\sigma(3)} U^*_{p,\sigma(2)} U^*_{p,\sigma(1)} \otimes U_{p,\sigma(1)} \otimes U_{p,\sigma(2)} \otimes U_{p,\sigma(3)},$$

Remark 9.2. The Hochschild cycle $c_{1,2,3}$ is the analog of a fundamental form for $\mathscr{D}$.

Remark 9.3. Cyclic cocycles are Hochschild cocycles and thus the pairings $\langle c_I, \varphi_K \rangle$ between Hochschild cycles and cocycles exist. If we consider only *Hochschild* cocycles, $(\varphi_{1,3}, \varphi_{2,3}, \varphi_{1,2})$ are dual in the above sense to $(c_{1,3}, c_{2,3}, c_{1,2})$ where $c_{1,2} = U_1^* U_2^* \otimes U_2 \otimes U_1 - U_2^* U_1^* \otimes U_1 \otimes U_2$.

Remark 9.4. The formulas of these cycles are very similar to shuffle products of c_i. However, the shuffle product doesn't apply directly, since D is not commutative.

Proof. It is obvious that c_1 and c_2 are Hochschild cycles. It is a straightforward consequence of (2.5) that c_3 is closed.

To prove that the $c_{i,3}$ and $c_{1,2,3}$ are Hochschild cycles, we essentially adapt the proof of [23], lemma 12.15. We can apply the same arguments because

$$e^{-i4\pi\mu} U_1 \xi = \xi U_1 \qquad\qquad e^{-i4\pi\nu} U_2 \xi = \xi U_2.$$

To compensate the fact that ξ_p is not unitary, we sum over p and use (2.5). The proof is then a set of lengthy but otherwise straightforward computations.

We only prove that $c_{1,2,3}$ is a Hochschild cycle and that it pairs non trivially with $\varphi_{1,2,3}$, the other calculations are easier cases of the same thing. We want to evaluate

$$\left\langle \phi_{1,2,3}, \sum_i v_i \right\rangle =$$

$$\sum_i \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_3} \sum_{\sigma' \in \Sigma_3} \varepsilon(\sigma') \varepsilon(\sigma) \tau(U^*_{i,\sigma(3)} U^*_{i,\sigma(2)} U^*_{i,\sigma(1)} \partial_{\sigma'(1)} U_{i,\sigma(1)} \partial_{\sigma'(2)} U_{i,\sigma(2)} \partial_{\sigma'(3)} U_{i,\sigma(3)}).$$

Fix σ and σ' and denote by $T_{\sigma,\sigma'}$ the associated term in the above sum. Notice that $\partial_3(U_{p,j}) = \delta_{3,j} i2\pi U_{p,j}$. We can find j_3 such that $\sigma(j_3) = 3$. If $\sigma(j_3) = 3 \neq \sigma'(j_3)$, then $T_{\sigma,\sigma'} = 0$. As $\partial_2(U_{p,j}) = -\delta_{2,j} i2\pi U_{p,j}$, if $\sigma(j_2) = 2 \neq \sigma'(j_2)$ then $T_{\sigma,\sigma'} = 0$. Thus $\sigma \neq \sigma'$ implies $T_{\sigma,\sigma'} = 0$. Finally, $\partial_1(U_{p,j}) = -\delta_{1,j} i2\pi U_{p,j}$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\left\langle \phi_{1,2,3}, \sum_i v_i \right\rangle &= (i2\pi)^3 \sum_i \sum_{\sigma\in\Sigma_3} \tau\Big(U^*_{i,\sigma(3)} U^*_{i,\sigma(2)} U^*_{i,\sigma(1)} U_{i,\sigma(1)} U_{i,\sigma(2)} U_{i,\sigma(3)}\Big) \\ &= (i2\pi)^3 \sum_i \sum_{\sigma\in\Sigma_3} \tau(\xi_i^* \xi_i) = (i2\pi)^3 6 \neq 0,\end{aligned}$$

by using the trace property of τ. □

About the construction of U_3: the proposition 5.3 and the lemma 6.5 essentially show that U_3 realises an isomorphism $E^c \oplus E^{-c} \simeq 2E^0$, where E^t is the line bundle over T^2 with twisting t. Another unitary could be constructed, that would realise the isomorphism $E^1 \oplus E^{-1} \simeq E^{c-1} \oplus E^{-(c-1)}$. This unitary together with U_1, U_2 would probably be a generator of $K_1(D)$. However, the necessary computations are much more involved.

To conclude, on top of its possible implications on noncommutative 3-spheres, our study may foster intuition on Pimsner algebras. In the case of QHM, the "transfer formula" (7.3) shows how we can "transfer" a pairing from the Pimsner algebra to the basis algebra, thereby generalising a property of Nest [19]. It would be interesting to investigate if this is a general phenomenon for Pimsner algebras.

A From Pimsner Algebras to Toeplitz Algebras

This section is concerned with the identification of the Toeplitz algebras for general Pimsner algebras in the sense of [16]. We will rely on the gauge-invariant uniqueness theorem of [16]. In the following, we denote by $\mathscr{L}(E_B)$ (resp. $\mathscr{K}(E_B)$) the adjointable (resp. compact) operators of the Hilbert module E_B (see [17]) and by $\Theta_{\xi,\eta}$ the adjointable operator defined by $\Theta_{\xi,\eta}(\zeta) = \xi\langle\eta|\zeta\rangle$. We also let A and B be two C^*-algebras.

Definition A.1 (C^*-correspondence)**.** A *C^*-correspondence* ${}_AE_B$ from A to B is given by

(i) a right Hilbert module E_B, with scalar product $\langle\cdot|\cdot\rangle_B$;

(ii) a $*$-homomorphism $\phi\colon A \to \mathscr{L}(E_B)$.

Definition A.2 (representation of C^*-correspondence)**.** A *representation of the C^*-correspondence* ${}_AE_A$ on a C^*-algebra B is a pair $(\pi, \mathcal{T})$ consisting of

- a $*$-homomorphism of algebras $\pi\colon A \to B$;
- a linear map $\mathcal{T}\colon E \to B$ which satisfies
  (i) $\mathcal{T}(\xi)^*\mathcal{T}(\zeta) = \pi(\langle\xi|\zeta\rangle_A)$,
  (ii) $\mathcal{T}(\xi)\pi(a) = \mathcal{T}(\xi a)$,
  (iii) $\pi(a)\mathcal{T}(\xi) = \mathcal{T}(\phi(a)\xi)$.

Notice that (ii) is in fact a consequence of (i) (see [16], definition 2.1).

Notation A.3. Given a representation $(\pi, \mathcal{T})$, we denote by $C^*(\pi, \mathcal{T})$ the C^*-algebra in B by $\pi(A) \cup \mathcal{T}(E)$.

Definition A.4 (Toeplitz algebra)**.** The *Toeplitz algebra* $\mathcal{T}_E^A$ associated to a C^*-correspondence ${}_AE_A$ is the universal C^*-algebra generated by the representations of ${}_AE_A$.

We also need the following definition (compare [16], definition 2.3):

Definition A.5. If ${}_AE_A$ is a C^*-correspondence and $(\pi, \mathcal{T})$ a representation of E on B, there is a $*$-homomorphism $\pi^{(1)} : \mathscr{K}(E) \to B$ defined by:

$$\pi^{(1)}(\Theta_{\xi,\zeta}) = \mathcal{T}(\xi)\mathcal{T}(\zeta)^*.$$

Proposition A.6. *Let ${}_AE_A$ be a C^*-correspondence. One can define a representation (π, τ) of E on $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{C}} \otimes \mathcal{O}_E$ by:*

$$\pi(a) = 1 \otimes a \qquad\qquad \tau(\xi) = S \otimes S_\xi.$$

This representation induces an isomorphism $\Phi : \mathcal{T}_E \longrightarrow C^*(\pi, \tau)$.

Since the Toeplitz algebra $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{C}}$ is nuclear, we do not need to specify which C^*-norm we use to define $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{C}} \otimes \mathcal{O}_E$.

Proof. Check first that (π, τ) is indeed a representation:

(i) $\tau(\xi)^*\tau(\zeta) = (S^* \otimes S_\xi^*)(S \otimes S_\zeta) = 1 \otimes \langle \xi, \zeta \rangle = \pi(\langle \xi, \zeta \rangle)$;

(ii) this point is a consequence of (i);

(iii) $\pi(a)\tau(\xi) = (1 \otimes a)(S \otimes S_\xi) = S \otimes aS_\xi = S \otimes S_{\phi(a)\xi} = \tau(\phi(a)\xi)$.

Therefore, there is a homomorphism $\Phi : \mathcal{T}_E \to \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{C}} \otimes \mathcal{O}_E$ defined on generators by:

$$\Psi(a) = 1 \otimes a \qquad\qquad \Psi(\mathcal{T}_\xi) = S \otimes S_\xi.$$

To prove that this is an isomorphism, we use gauge-invariant uniqueness theorem for Toeplitz algebra (theorem 6.2, [16]).

For this representation $(\pi, \mathcal{T})$,

$$\tau(\xi)\tau(\zeta)^* = SS^* \otimes S_\xi S_\zeta^* = (1 - P) \otimes S_\xi S_\zeta^*$$

hence $\operatorname{Im} \pi^{(1)} \subseteq (1 - P) \otimes {\mathcal{O}_E}^{(0)}$. Since the image of A by π is $1 \otimes A$, $I'_{(\pi,\tau)} = \{a \in A | \pi(a) \in B_1 = \pi^{(1)}(\mathscr{K}(E))\} = 0$.

One can define an action $\widetilde{\beta} : S^1 \curvearrowright \mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{C}} \otimes \mathcal{O}_E$ by

$$\widetilde{\beta}_t(S^n \otimes F) = e^{i2\pi nt} S^n \otimes F,$$

where $F \in \mathcal{O}_E$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

We hence get a gauge action β on $C^*(\pi, \tau)$ by restriction of $\widetilde{\beta}$:

$$\beta_t(\pi(a)) = \beta_t(1 \otimes a) = \pi(a) \quad \beta_t(\tau(\xi)) = \beta_t\left(S \otimes S_\xi\right) = e^{i2\pi t} S \otimes S_\xi = e^{i2\pi t}\tau(\xi).$$

Consequently, $\Phi : \mathcal{T}_E \longrightarrow C^*(\pi, \tau)$ is an isomorphism. ☐

References

[1] B. Abadie. “Vector bundles” over quantum Heisenberg manifolds. In *Algebraic methods in Operator Theory*, pages 307–315. Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1994.

[2] B. Abadie. Generalized fixed-point algebras of certain actions on crossed products. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, 171(1):1–21, 1995.

[3] B. Abadie. The range of traces on quantum Heisenberg manifolds. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 352(12):5767–5780 (electronic), 2000.

[4] B. Abadie, S. Eilers, and R. Exel. Morita equivalence for crossed products by Hilbert C^*-bimodules. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 350:3043–3054, 1998.

[5] B. Abadie and R. Exel. Hilbert C^*-bimodules over commutative C^*-algebras and an isomorphism condition for quantum Heisenberg manifolds. *Reviews in Mathematical Physics. A Journal for Both Review and Original Research Papers in the Field of Mathematical Physics*, 9:411–423, 1997.

[6] P. S. Chakraborty. Metrics on the quantum Heisenberg manifold. *Journal of Operator Theory*, 54(1):93–100, 2005.

[7] P. S. Chakraborty and K. B. Sinha. Geometry on the quantum Heisenberg manifold. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 203(2):425–452, 2003.

[8] A. Connes. Noncommutative differential geometry. *Institut des Hautes Études Scientifiques. Publications Mathématiques*, (62):257–360, 1985.

[9] A. Connes. *Noncommutative geometry.* Academic Press Inc., San Diego, CA, 1994.

[10] A. Connes and M. Dubois-Violette. Noncommutative finite-dimensional manifolds. I. Spherical manifolds and related examples. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 230(3):539–579, 2002.

[11] A. Connes and M. Dubois-Violette. Noncommutative finite dimensional manifolds. II. moduli space and structure of noncommutative 3-spheres. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 281(1):23–127, 2008.

[12] J. Cuntz. Bivariant K-theory and the Weyl algebra. *K-Theory. An Interdisciplinary Journal for the Development, Application, and Influence of K-Theory in the Mathematical Sciences*, 35(1-2):93–137, 2005.

[13] J. Cuntz and D. Quillen. Excision in bivariant periodic cyclic cohomology. *Inventiones Mathematicae*, 127(1):67–98, 1996.

[14] O. Gabriel and M. Grensing. Exact Sequences for Locally Convex Subalgebras of Pimsner Algebras with an Application to Quantum Heisenberg Manifolds. ”`http://people.math.jussieu.fr/~gabriel/kkTh-Pimsner.pdf`”.

[15] T. Katsura. A construction of C^*-algebras from C^*-correspondences. In *Advances in quantum dynamics (South Hadley, MA, 2002)*, volume 335 of *Contemp. Math.*, page 173–182. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2003.

[16] T. Katsura. On C^*-algebras associated with C^*-correspondences. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 217(2):366–401, 2004.

[17] E. C. Lance. *Hilbert C^*-modules*, volume 210 of *London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995. A toolkit for operator algebraists.

[18] J. Loday. *Cyclic homology*, volume 301 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences].* Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 1998. Appendix E by Maria O. Ronco, Chapter 13 by the author in collaboration with Teimuraz Pirashvili.

[19] R. Nest. Cyclic cohomology of crossed products with $\mathbb{Z}$. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 80(2):235–283, 1988.

[20] M. V. Pimsner. *A class of C^*-algebras generalizing both Cuntz-Krieger algebras and crossed products by* $\mathbb{Z}$, volume 12 of *Fields Inst. Commun.*, pages 189–212. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1997.

[21] M. A. Rieffel. The cancellation theorem for projective modules over irrational rotation C^*-algebras. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society. Third Series*, 47(2):285–302, 1983.

[22] M. A. Rieffel. Deformation quantization of Heisenberg manifolds. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 122(4):531–562, 1989.

[23] J. C. Varilly, H. Figueroa, and J. M. Gracia-Bondia. *Elements of Noncommutative Geometry.* Birkhäuser Boston, 1 edition, Oct. 2000.